23358

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / *THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE*

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* MR. Dominique A.M.Y. ABRIOUX

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* The Dramaturgy of Timon of Athens on the English and French Stage

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* Univ. of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ* 1974

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. E.J.H. Greene

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 10. 9. 74 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Dominique Abrioux

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 212 Hichener Park

Edmonton, Alta.

NL-91 (11-73)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE DRAMATURGY OF TIMON OF ATHENS ON THE ENGLISH AND FRENCH STAGE

by

© DOMINIQUE A. M. X. ABRIOUX

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Dramaturgy of Timon of Athens on the English and French Stage", submitted by Dominique A. M. X. Abrioux in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Comparative Literature.

E. D. Kruse
Supervisor

Alison Scott

Date: September 6, 1974

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is two-fold. On the one hand an examination of the handling of the Timon theme on the English and French stages during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will demonstrate the parallelisms and differences of dramatic theory and practice from a comparative perspective. On the other hand, the adaptations on the English stage and the variations on the French stage will show the dramaturgic treatment of the Timon theme from Shakespeare to Destouches.

Whereas French dramatizations of Timon's life consist of independent plays which have in common only their source, Lucian's Timon, the treatment of this classical theme on the English stage consists solely of adaptations of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens. Of all the Timon plays Destouches' Le Dissipateur has enjoyed the greatest success, though its triumph was nevertheless short-lived. This author has made one fundamental change in his portrayal of Timon's life: the protagonist, a dissipating young bourgeois, does not turn misanthrope. By this change, Destouches has avoided the problem which all other playwrights consciously or subconsciously faced: the incompatibility of the theme of the classical Timon, a squanderer turned misanthrope, with the dramatic genre, whether tragedy or comedy.

I would like to thank Dr. E. J. H. Greene for the constructive advice and kind assistance on which I was able to rely throughout the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	1
I	SHAKESPEARE'S *TIMON OF ATHENS*	5
II	A RESTORATION ADAPTATION	21
	Shadwell's *The History of Timon of Athens, The Man-Hater*	
III	ADAPTATIONS BY LOVE AND CUMBERLAND	35
IV	BRECOURT'S *TIMON*	50
V	*TIMON* AT THE *THEATRE ITALIEN*	62
	Barante's *Arlequin Misantrope*	63
	De Lisle's *Timon le Misantrope*	71
VI	DESTOUCHES' *LE DISSIPATEUR*	79
	CONCLUSION	94

***

FOOTNOTES		98
BIBLIOGRAPHY		106
APPENDIX	FURTHER ALTERATIONS BY LOVE AND CUMBERLAND	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table (Blocking)	Description	Page
I	Shakespeare: *Timon of Athens*	10
II	Shadwell: *The History of Timon of Athens, The Man-Hater*	25
III	Love: *Timon of Athens*	39
IV	Cumberland: *Timon of Athens*	45
V	Lamb: *Timon of Athens*	48
VI	Brécourt: *Les Flateurs trompez ou l'ennemy des faux amis*	57
VII	Barante: *Arlequin Misantrope*	65
VIII	De Lisle: *Timon le Misantrope*	73
IX	Destouches: *Le Dissipateur*	86

INTRODUCTION

In classical literature there are two treatments of the story of Timon of Athens: whereas Plutarch introduces it into his Life of Marcus Antonius only parenthetically, Lucian utilizes it as the nucleus of his satiric dialogue entitled Timon the Misanthrope. Plutarch's tale was translated into English by Paynter in The Palace of Pleasure (1566) and by North in The Lives (1579). Lucian's dialogue, although it did not appear in English translation until published by Thomas Heywood in 1637, had previously been available in Latin, French and Italian translations. That Timon's life was well-known to classical authors is evident from the numerous references made to his nature: Aristophanes: Lysistrata, Birds; Callimachus: Epigrams; Pliny: Natural History, vii.

Shakespeare's dramatic version of Timon's life originally appeared in the First Folio between Romeo and Juliet and Julius Caesar, a position for which it was never intended.[1] The stage history of Timon of Athens, never a success in its original form, has been most eccentric: there is no positive evidence that it was ever produced before Shadwell's adaptation of 1678. This version, well-suited to the Restoration stage, was effectively performed during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Prior to George Lamb's adaptation of 1816 in which an attempt was made "to restore Shakespeare

to the stage, with no other omissions than such as the refinement of manners has rendered necessary",[2] there had been three unsuccessful attempts at blending Shakespeare and Shadwell: James Love staged his version of Timon of Athens ten times at Richmond during 1768; Cumberland's adaptation, first performed on December 4, 1771, enjoyed eleven performances in 1771 and 1772, with one revival in 1783; Thomas Hull produced yet another adaptation at Covent Garden on May 3, 1786, a version which was neither published nor performed again.

The French stage witnessed four versions of Timon during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Although there is no decisive evidence to indicate a relationship between these versions and Shakespeare's, the plays do attest recognition of the Timon theme as a dramatic subject. Brécourt's Timon, first performed on August 13, 1684 and republished in 1699 as Les Flateurs trompez ou l'ennemy des faux amis, was produced seventeen times. On December 22, 1696, Barante's Arlequin Misantrope, a play clearly affected by the Timon story, was staged by the Comédiens Italiens du Roi in the Hôtel de Bourgogne. January 2, 1722 saw the initial performance of a successful play, Timon le Misantrope; performed thirty-eight times in the course of that year, De Lisle's version was also translated into Dutch, Flemish and English. Destouches' Le Dissipateur, despite the author's claims to originality, does appear to be indebted to the Timon theme as rendered by

Shakespeare and subsequent British dramatists. By reason of the creative use made of the source material, the success of this play overshadows that of any other version: first performed in the Provinces in 1736, in Paris on March 23, 1753, two hundred and fifty-five performances had been recorded by 1851.

The French reading public must have been well acquainted with Shakespeare's Timon of Athens by the latter half of the eighteenth century. Between 1746 and 1749 Pierre de la Place translated the play, as did Pierre Letourneur between 1776 and 1782. The first undeniable imitation of Shakespeare's play seems to have been Louis-Sebastian Mercier's Timon d'Athenes en cinq actes et en prose, imitation de Shakespeare, Paris 'an. iii.' written in 1794, but it appears to have encountered a similar fate as that of its model since there is no positive record that it was ever produced.

The Timon theme on the French stage has been almost totally ignored by scholars. Studies of the same theme in English drama have dealt primarily with the structure of Shakespeare's play and the ensuing problems: due to textual difficulties and the absence of a causal sequence in the action, Hermann Ulrici first suggested in 1815 that the First Folio text "wanted the author's last finishing touch, in consequence either of his retirement to Stratford, or his death".[3] This 'unfinished' theory has been upheld, though on different grounds, by many critics, including W. Wendlandt,

E. K. Chambers, H. J. Oliver, U. Ellis-Fermor and J. C. Maxwell. Another explanation advanced to account for the problematic state of this play was that Shakespeare was not totally responsible for the drama. This theory of 'divided' authorship was originally proposed by Charles Knight in his 1839 edition of Shakespeare's works and has subsequently been expanded upon by H. Staunton, G. Verplanck, H. Hudson, F. Fleay, E. Wright and T. Parrott.

The originality of this study resides in the fact that it goes beyond both the 'divided' authorship and 'unfinished' theories with the underlying purpose of examining the dramaturgic handling of the theme as witnessed in versions and adaptations which have been performed on the stage in England and France.

I

SHAKESPEARE'S TIMON OF ATHENS

The apparently unfinished condition of The Life of Timon of Athens is the fundamental reason for its failure as a stage play in its original form.[4] The theory which contends that the play is in fact unfinished Shakespearean rather than partially non-Shakespearean has been strengthened by the self-defeating theories of divided authorship. The latter, working on the assumption that the play in its entirety is unworthy of Shakespeare, attempted to attribute the weaker parts of the drama to an inferior dramatist, but did in fact assign some of the best scenes (Act III, 1-3) and some which are vital to the plot (Act II, 2) to Shakespeare's alleged collaborator. The irregular versification, together with the loose ends in the plot which brought about the theory that a collaborator or a reviser had aided Shakespeare, does more in reality to further the concept of Timon of Athens as an unfinished, yet wholly Shakespearean text: had a second hand worked on the play, these very irregularities would have been rectified. Una Ellis-Fermor, in an influential study,[5] does in fact show that Alcibiades' discourse to the Senators in Act III, 5 is comprised of a series of broken speeches which "a man who was roughing out

a scene might leave".[6] This scene, attributed to the inferior playwright by all who held the divided authorship theory, is, despite its unfinished form, the most dramatic scene up till this point. This speech, together with "the presence of many such in the play, and in speeches of undeniable majesty and power"[7] enables Una Ellis-Fermor to maintain that Shakespeare alone is responsible for Timon of Athens. Furthermore, as was pointed out by Caroline Spurgeon,[8] scenes and passages which one would otherwise hesitate to assign to Shakespeare, do nevertheless contain images which are undeniably Shakespearean. Of equal importance is the repetitious imagery which is evident in scenes which are incontestably Shakespearean and in others whose authorship has been questioned. H. J. Oliver, in his introduction to the Arden edition of Timon of Athens, brings forward such an example:

> I should like to add that certain repetitions of imagery and idea in Timon argue strongly for a single author. For example, the man who wrote Timon's lines
>
> But then renew I could not like
> the moon;
> There were no suns to borrow of (IV. iii. 69-70)
>
> must surely have written the earlier prediction by Lucius' servant:
>
> You must consider that a prodigal
> course
> Is like the sun's,
> But not, like his, recoverable. (III.iv. 12-14)
>
> - significantly, the one in a scene usually given to Shakespeare, the other in a scene given to the collaborator or reviser. ...The theory of divided authorship must surely give way before such evidence as this. [9]

If we accept the premise that Timon of Athens is unfinished,

the reason for Shakespeare's leaving it in this incomplete state must be sought. Excuses such as Shakespeare's boredom[10] and the threat of a nervous breakdown[11] appear to miss the point. Miss Ellis-Fermor, in suggesting that the play is "unfinished in conception", that is, that "Shakespeare chose the wrong character to support his theme and consequently the wrong outer action as the mirror of the inner action"[12], aided Oliver in reaching the crux of the matter: Timon is in fact the right person for the theme, but neither the hero nor the theme lend themselves to drama. Timon, who is ruined from the beginning of the action, but who does not realize it, is a schematic presentation of an unintegrated personality. Both before and after his downfall, this colourless character, about whom little is known, is an illustration of excess. Both extremist and absolutist, he is best characterized by Apemantus' declaration "The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends" (Act IV, 3). In fact, according to Aristotelian standards, Timon is not a true tragic hero: he is the protagonist, yet is unaware of what is happening to him; in essence, he appears insensitive to human feelings, his generosity being public, not private; there is no tragic recognition since Timon's soliloquies in the second half of the play are denunciations of mankind, not self-exhortations and self-analyses.

The story of Timon, as portrayed by Shakespeare, is ill-suited for the stage since it provides little dramatic

movement due to its lack of action and visual interest. The outline of the action is diagrammatic and unusually simple. Act I, 1 serves as a general introduction in which the Poet, an incarnation of the classical prologue, projects the design of the ensuing action. The remainder of Act I, from Timon's appearance onwards, consists in Timon's acting out of the adept description of him which the Poet and Painter had furnished. Act II, neatly divided into two parts, consists on the one hand of the presentation of Athenian society and the citizens' knowledge of Timon's inevitable fall, and on the other hand of Timon's eventual awareness of his ruinous state. However, especially in the earlier part of this act, the action dawdles since we are already aware of Timon's folly and dissipation to which the author repeatedly returns. Act III, similarly composed of two parts, reveals both the ingratitude of his friends and Timon's reaction to their ungratefulness. H. S. Wilson sees in the final two acts a lyrical rhapsody on the theme of hatred, "the climax towards which the action has been building all along, a torrent of dithyrambic hate and loathing of mankind".[13] With such a climax, there is little room for true dramatic movement. This effect is achieved by contrasting Alcibiades' banishment to Timon's self-imposed exile. The one, excluded from Athenian society, plans revenge; for the other, Timon, his withdrawal is revenge.

The problem of such a linear structure in which Timon,

flanked by his faithful steward, remains central throughout, is the absence of a genuine dramatic conflict. If there is a protagonist, this person must be Timon; in this case the antagonist must be the entire Athenian society against which he struggles in his denunciation of hypocrisy and human greed. This state of affairs is never resolved. In fact it does not represent a true conflict since all that has occurred is that his friends, after taking advantage of his vain generosity, forget him once he is in need. This absence of conflict, coupled with the lack of characterization, has led numerous critics to hastily deduce that Timon of Athens was intended as a fable or a parable. The play, in its present unfinished state, may well appear to be a morality drama, but that this was the author's intention is most doubtful.

The dramatic technique on which the effect of the play relies is that of accumulation by means of variations on a theme. The structure works analogically rather than causatively but because of the lack of integration between scenes, the dramatic action becomes schematic and episodic. Both the looseness and the episodic nature of the structure, for which the unfinished condition of the play is partly responsible, are evident in the play's blocking. Of the forty-two characters in Timon of Athens, twenty-two appear during only one scene, a further six in two scenes. The Poet and the Painter appear in Act I, 1 and having introduced the

TABLE I SHAKESPEARE'S TIMON OF ATHENS

ACT	I		II		III						IV			V				TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	1	2	3	4		
TIMON	38	30		19				11		8	1		73	27				207	8
LUCULLUS(1st Lord)	5	4		*	6					15								30	5
LUCIUS(2nd Lord)	6	5		*		10				18								39	5
SEMPRONIUS(3rd Lord)		2		*			2			7								11	4
VENTIDIUS(4th Lord)		2		*						3								5	3
ALCIBIADES	1	3		*					12				16				4	36	6
APEMANTUS	33	13		16									38					100	4
STEWARD		5		16				7				3	7	4				42	6
FLAMINIUS(1st Serv.)		4		2	6			3				2						17	5
SERVILIUS(2nd Serv.)		1		1		6						1						9	4
LUCILIUS(3rd Serv.)	3	1		1			2					1						8	5
CAPHIS			3	15														18	2
HORT.,PHIL.,TITUS								21										21	1
VARRO's 1st Serv.				13				6										19	2
VARRO's 2nd Serv.								4										4	1
LUCIUS' Serv.								15										15	1
VENTIDIUS' Mess.	4														2			6	2
POET	21													15				36	2
PAINTER	18													18				36	2
JEWELLER	8																	8	1
MERCHANT	8																	8	1
HOST.and 2 STRANGERS						8												8	1
OLD ATHENIAN	10																	10	1
PAGE and FOOL				12														12	1
PHRYNIA and TYMANDRA													10					10	1
1st SENATOR			4	*					9	*				12			5	30	6
2nd SENATOR				*					4	*				5			5	14	5
3rd SENATOR				*					1	*					2			3	4
4th SENATOR															1			1	1
SOLDIER																1	1	2	2
3 BANDITTI													23					23	1
CUPID and AMAZONS		5																5	1

theme of the play in semi-symbolic fashion, they proceed to demonstrate that like all other members of Timon's entourage, they themselves are flatterers. Once, in Act V, 1, they reappear to benefit from their patron's newly found wealth. The dramatic use of these characters, described by Samuel Johnson as an "impropriety",[14] appears weak on two accounts. First, their approach is alluded to by Apemantus in the preceding act, one hundred and eighty-eight lines before, but their appearance is delayed by two episodes, the one involving the Banditti, the other Flavius. Nor can this lapse be accounted for by an error on the part of the printers of the Folio, since the Painter makes reference to Timon's treatment of the Banditti. Second, the Poet and the Painter serve no dramatically justified function in this scene which is simply a variation on a theme previously exemplified by Alcibiades' whores and taken up again by the Senators.

One of the principal themes in the first act concerns Timon's generosity. This is first apparent in the service he renders Ventidius and subsequently in his dealings with the Old Athenian, the Poet, the Painter and the Lords. The dramatic function served by Ventidius is sound since a certain balance is established between the two scenes of Act I: in the first, Timon, in conversation with Ventidius' messenger, declares that he will pay the five talent debt which is outstanding. His generosity appears sincere and well-meaning,

but following his exchange with Ventidius in the second scene, the true nature of Timon's philanthropy comes to light: by believing that "there's none/ Can truly say he gives, if he receives" (Act I, 2), Timon is using his generosity in order to attract praise and flattery. One cannot discern the extent to which this action is conscious, but the sincerity and purpose behind his prodigality become questionable. Generosity represents a point of honour for Timon. In Act I, 2 he feels compelled to repay twofold all honours which have been bestowed upon him. The Lords, who give so that they will in turn receive, are in a position to take full advantage of Timon and the dramatic use of these characters is of fundamental importance since it is their presence in this scene which paves the way for Timon's attempts in Act III to secure funds. Whereas the exchanges between Timon and the Lords have been well woven into the action of the play, the same is not true of the dialogue with the Old Athenian in which Timon volunteers to give his servant Lucilius three talents so that he may marry the Old Athenian's daughter. The validity of such a confrontation is not in doubt since it serves to demonstrate that Timon is equally generous in his dealings with subordinates and peers, but the Old Athenian, since he never reappears, does constitute a loose end. Two possibilities were open to the dramatist: the Old Athenian could either have been replaced by one of the Lords, or he could have been reintroduced in

Act III as yet another ungrateful beneficiary. An alteration such as the latter one would have strengthened the link between Timon's philanthropy and his friends' ingratitude, a connection well-established in all other instances.

The lack of integration in the development of the play's action is noticeable in other instances. Such a case in point centers around the Fool's appearance in Act II, 2; the looseness in the design led Samuel Johnson to suspect "some scene to be lost in which the entrance of the fool, and the page that follows him, was prepared by some introductory dialogue, and the audience was informed that they were the fool and the page of Phrynia, Temandra, or some courtisane, upon the knowledge of which depends the greater part of the ensuing jocularity".[15] The Fool, whose mistress is a whore, occupies the stage for a very short period of time (125 lines). After this initial appearance, he is neither seen nor heard of again. While on stage, he does, however, serve a dramatic function: on the one hand he provides comic relief, on the other hand, by referring to the similarity between his mistress's profession and that of a usurer, he adds to the low image of contemporary Athens. Prior to his appearance, Timon and his Steward are in conversation, a conversation which is resumed immediately following the Fool's exit. On this account it has been argued that one of the Fool's dramatic functions is to enable the Steward to make Timon aware of his

financial situation.[16] This function is served during the interval, but no more so by the Fool than by Apemantus who, by his jesting with the creditors' servants, is in a position to say equally well anything which the Fool says. On account of the possible link which exists between the Fool, the Page and Alcibiades' two mistresses, it is feasible to surmise that this scene is a false start on a comic subplot.

The Strangers who appear in Act III, 2 are totally uninvolved in the action of the play. They come unannounced from an outside world and return there following their brief appearance. Their function is that of a chorus since they are present in order to offer an objective judgement of the behaviour demonstrated by the Lords when confronted with Timon's request for help. In the true manner of a chorus, they speak unanimously in denouncing Lucius' hypocritical reaction to the needs of his friend. The importance which Shakespeare has given to this scene is apparent in its carefully planned position: it is the second of three consecutive scenes in which Timon's beneficiaries refuse to assist him. As far as it goes, the use of such a device is most effective; unfortunately, the dramatist does not use it again, as it might well have been, in Act IV, to appraise Timon's misanthropic conduct. Instead, a most improbable meeting occurs between Timon and the Banditti, a meeting which is both undramatic due to the lack of ferocity exhibited, and

unprepared. The introduction of these characters at this point in the action is, moreover, unnecessary since nothing is said by them or to them which has not been previously mentioned. In giving gold to Alcibiades, Timon had said:

> Here's gold. Go on.
> Be as a planetary plague, when Jove
> Will o'er some high-vic'd city hang
> his poison
> In the sick air. (Act IV, 3)

Little is added by saying to the Banditti:

> Here's gold. Go, suck the subtle blood
> o' th' grape,
> Till the high fever seethe your blood
> to froth,
> And so 'scape hanging. Trust not the
> physician;
> His antidotes are poison (Act IV, 3)

This section of Act IV, 3 demonstrates only the dramatic technique of accumulation but it would have been put to better use had the choral element reappeared. Such a choice would have strengthened the initial use of the chorus and also have improved Act IV.

It must be said that the unity of action in Timon of Athens is broken neither by loose ends nor by the Alcibiades subplot. The function served by the story of Alcibiades is clear: both a parallel and a contrast to Timon's situation are intended. This is attained without displacing Timon from the central position he occupies throughout the play, since no systematic parallel or contrast in their lives and ideologies is undertaken. The purpose served by Alcibiades is evident, but the manner in which he has been incorporated

into the design of the play lacks efficacy.

Until Act III, 5 Alcibiades is a very minor character. He appears twice in Act I, but neither says nor does anything of any significance. He crosses the stage during the first confrontation between Timon and his creditors' servants in Act II. Suddenly, at the beginning of Act III, 5, his role assumes undue importance: in conversation with the same senators who had previously refused to help Timon, Alcibiades is appealing for the life of a fellow soldier who killed an Athenian in hot blood. This scene, rich in dramatic force and by far the most dramatic scene up to this point, loses some of its impact for two reasons. First, the scene has been ill-prepared in comparison to its importance. There has been nothing prior to this scene to indicate that Alcibiades is about to assume a major role in an action running parallel to the main theme centered around Timon, and will in fact bring about the conclusion of the play. Furthermore, despite the structural importance of the scene, little light is shed on the character around whom the controversy arose. The Senators consider him to be a "sworn rioter", Alcibiades a "man...of comely virtues". After this scene we are told nothing concerning this soldier, and can only assume that the sentence of death has been carried out.

The Alcibiades subplot, essential as it may be to the remainder of the play and highly dramatic as a self-contained action, is, however, badly managed. Due to the fortuitous

condemnation of an unknown soldier, Alcibiades, for reasons unknown, takes up his defence before the Athenian Senate and thus enables both a parallel and a contrast to be drawn between his actions and those of Timon. The absence of verisimilitude in this respect is heightened by Timon's timely death, which, corresponding as it does to Athens' capitulation, enables Alcibiades to avenge the wrongful actions committed against both himself and Timon. As Paul Bacquet postulates: "les liens qui rattachent l'aventure du soldat à celle du protagoniste résultent d'une coïncidence ou de la conjonction fortuite des événements et non d'une commune et unique résolution. C'est là, du point de vue dramatique, une occasion manquée, même si l'auteur entend plus tard exploiter le contraste entre le comportement du militaire et celui de Timon et s'il utilise cette ligue des haines pour illustrer le thème de la Fortune, appliqué cette fois à Athènes".[17]

English dramatists, unlike their French counterparts, seldom observed the unities of time and place which Sir Philip Sidney referred to as "the two necessary companions of all corporal actions".[18] The disregard which Shakespeare exhibits for these two rules is in perfect keeping with his other plays. The duration of the action requires at least four days. The very nature of the play's subject matter renders the observation of the unities of time and place impractical; had the dramatist in fact desired to adhere to these rules, the

play as a whole would have suffered: to have portrayed Timon as a philanthropist in the morning and as a misanthropist in the evening would not only have detracted from the play's verisimilitude, but would also have entailed a reduction in the already minimal action.

Shakespeare's strict adherence to the decorum of his time is in some cases detrimental to the verisimilitude of the action. Timon, who does not die on stage, is found buried by one of Alcibiades' soldiers who, in accordance with the Folio's stage directions, had been "seeking Timon".[19] How Timon died is open to conjecture, but the fact remains that the Soldier who finds his grave is simply a deus ex machina, since no reason is given for his visit. Furthermore, as Samuel Johnson pointed out, "there is something elaborately unskilful in the contrivance of sending a soldier, who cannot read, to take the epitaph in wax, only that it may close the play by being read with more solemnity in the last scene".[20] The dénouement, which lacks verisimilitude, also suffers from an inept attempt to connect the subplot to the main plot. The conquest of Athens is superfluous because on the one hand there is no evidence to show that the corrupt Athens which was partly responsible for Timon's downfall will improve under Alcibiades, and on the other hand because it detracts from the tragic ending to Timon's life and consequently shifts the emphasis from the main theme to the subplot. Had there been no necessity to link plot and subplot, Timon's isolation and subsequent death would have been more dramatic: "l'adieu au

monde aurait pu être tragique; il n'est que philosophique, que poétique et symbolique".[21] The ending is an anti-climax: whereas not only Timon's death but also the destruction of the society so detested by him was expected, Athens lives on. Such an ending is better suited to comedy.

The failure of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens as a stage play, probably foreseen by him and therefore left unfinished, is then principally due to the impracticability of adapting Timon and his story to drama, and in particular to tragedy. There are several characteristics of high comedy in the play which would have one believe that the theme might have been better suited to this genre. The absence of a true conflict and the resulting limited action would also have affected a comedy, but the lack of characterization, the technique of accumulation and the satiric element would not have been serious defects. Schlegel, who holds the play in high esteem, does, however, consider the onrush of suitors who flock to Timon after he has found gold, most amusing. But the most prolific feature of comedy resides in the depiction of the false friends, the flatterers and creditors. These characters, due to their automatic, unhesitant and mechanical reactions, behave like puppets and "leurs dimensions et leur comportement les apparentent aux personnages de la farce ou de la comédie des humeurs".[22] Herein lies an important reason for the failure of the tragedy; it is these characters and their attitudes who turn Timon into a misanthrope. The fact that

"l'abîme est trop profond entre ces amibes et ce géant, entre leur automatisme élémentaire et comme chimique et sa haine universelle"[23] is one further factor in the relegation of Timon of Athens to the ranks of an unsuccessful stage play.

The dramatic shortcomings of this play resulted not only in Shakespeare's leaving it unfinished, but also in several attempts by subsequent dramatists to improve his drama. English playwrights were merely to adapt Shakespeare's Timon of Athens with a view to making a successful stage production out of it. French dramatists, who were initially unacquainted with Shakespeare's play and modeled themselves on Lucian's dialogue, were to limit the scope of the action by unveiling a Timon turned misanthrope in the first scene of the play.

II

A RESTORATION ADAPTATION

Thomas Shadwell's revision, licensed on February 18, 1677/8, is the first recorded performance of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, in its original form or in adaptation. The History of Timon of Athens, The Man-Hater, which according to Jaggard went through eleven editions before Tonson issued the first edition of Shakespeare's Timon as a separate work in 1734,[24] was a forerunner in the series of rewritings of Shakespeare's tragedies and historical plays. The success of Shadwell's Timon of Athens surpassed that of The Virtuoso (May 1676) and led Downes to state that the play "was very well Acted and the Musick in't well Perform'd; it wonderfully pleas'd the Court and City, being an Excellent Moral".[25] The reception encountered by this version, which Shadwell himself claimed to "have made into a play"[26], must have been furthered by the performances of such noteworthy actors as Mr. and Mrs. Betterton, Mr. Smith and Mr. Harris. Spencer, who finds little of any value in Restoration adaptations, does nevertheless rate Shadwell's Timon "as the best, or at any rate the least objectionable, of the Restoration tragedies"[27] and it is unfortunate that Shadwell is better remembered for the attention he receives in Dryden's MacFlecknoe than for his own dramatic ability.

Whereas Shakespeare's use of the anonymous Timon comedy,[28] which until edited by Dyce in 1842 existed solely in manuscript form, will always be a subject of debate, there are more substantial grounds for establishing a close connection between the old Timon and Shadwell's Timon. Since Shadwell inserted a love intrigue into Shakespeare's play, the plot outlines, with the exception of the theme of avarice for which the author of the anonymous Timon relied heavily on Plautus' Aulularia, bear close resemblance. So do numerous details: Melissa, the Restoration coquette, is as vain as Gelasimus and as mercenary as Callimela; Timon, who in both cases approaches his friends in person in order to borrow money, likewise attempts in both plays to have the marriage date brought forward. The similarity goes beyond such details and resides in the text itself. The resemblance in such cases as:

> Timon.- Why turnest thou thy face away from mee?
> What, am I such an eiesore now to thee? (Act III, 5)
>
> Timon.- What, did I fright you? am I become so
> dreadful
> An Object? is poverty contagious? (Act III, p.240)

has led John Edmunds to claim that "Shadwell seems to have the manuscript in front of him".[29] A similar parallel exists between Shadwell's Timon of Athens and Molière's Le Misanthrope or Wycherley's version, The Plain Dealer. Alceste is in love with a coquette while fully recognizing the seriousness and sincerity of Eliante's love for him. Such are the circumstances surrounding Timon's choice of Melissa over Evandra. Not only

is there a resemblance between Timon and Alceste, Melissa and Celimène, Evandra and Eliante, but also in the objects of satire including precious verse:

Alceste.- Franchement, il est bon à mettre
au cabinet.
Vous vous êtes réglé sur de méchants
modèles,
Et vos expressions ne sont point
naturelles...
Ce style figuré, dont on fait vanité,
Sort du bon caractère et de la vérité;
Ce n'est que jeu de mots, qu'affectation
pure,
Et ce n'est point ainsi que parle la
nature. (Act I, 2)

Apemantus.- Thy Poetrie's insipid, none can taste it:
Thou art a wordy foolish Scribler, who
Writ'st nothing but high-sounding frothy
stuff;
Thou spread'st, and beat'st out thy poor
little sence,
'Tis all leaf-gold, it has no weight in it.
Thou lov'st impertinent description,
And when thou hast a rapture, it is not
The sacred rapture of a Poet, but
Incoherent, extravagant, and unnatural,
Like madmens thoughts, and this thou
call'st Poetical.(Act II, p.217)

Shadwell's primary change in his attempt to make Shakespeare's Timon of Athens "into a play" is the introduction of two female characters, Evandra and Melissa. The significance of this insertion is twofold. First, following French tradition, Shadwell recognized that feminine interest was essential for popular success. Second, the dramatic use made of Melissa enabled him to closely integrate the Alcibiades subplot with the main theme. Shakespeare's Timon, when asked by Apemantus what he can best compare flatterers to, answers "Women nearest, but men - men are the things themselves" (Act IV, 3).

Herein lies the reasoning behind the absence of female characters: why deal with the second best when the best is readily available? Shadwell, aware of the similarity which existed between the Athenian political situation and that of Restoration England, saw in Shakespeare's play the opportunity to satirize not only flattery and false friendship, but also numerous other modes of behaviour. By bestowing upon Evandra the faithful traits of Flavius' character and consequently making Demetrius into a scheming rascal, Shadwell is able to launch a more effective attack on the coquettish Melissa and the mercenary love which she embodies:

> Evandra.- Suppose your Wife be false; (as 'tis not new
> In Athens;)...
> Since that base Cecropian Law
> Made Love a merchandize, to traffick hearts
> For Marriage, and for Dowry, who's secure?
> Now her great sign of Love, is, she's content
> To bind you in the strongest chains, and to
> A slavery, nought can manumize you from
> But death (Act I, pp.211-2).

Evandra and Melissa serve an important function both as vehicles of social satire and as added elements of intrigue, but the latter person's dramatic significance is more important yet.

The necessary link which Shadwell has added in establishing a close connection between plot and subplot is apparent in the blocking for the play. In Shakespeare, Alcibiades, who is

TABLE II

SHADWELL'S TIMON OF ATHENS

ACT	I		II		III				IV			V				TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	4		
TIMON	42	24	9	36	11		37	9	1		60	30		6		265	11
ALCIBIADES					8					22		14	8		15	67	5
APEMANTUS	23			29	11						23				5	91	5
NICIAS	2			6						17		7	8		4	44	6
PHAEAX	7			13	5			8		12		10	8		4	67	8
AELIUS	3			8	5			6		4		3	3		1	33	8
CLEON	1			3	3			4		4		2	1		1	19	8
ISANDER	1			1	6			4		4		1	3		1	21	8
ISIDORE	2			3				3		2		1	2		1	14	7
THRASILLUS	1			1				2		2		1	2		1	10	7
DEMETRIUS	20			3	8		9	*								40	5
DIPHILUS	2			1			*									3	3
OLD MAN	8															8	1
POET	28			5							9					42	3
PAINTER	7										4					11	2
JEWELLER and MERCHANT	8										10					18	2
MUSICIAN	1										6					7	2
EVANDRA		23		12			8				27	2		7		79	6
MELISSA			26	5		11	3				10				5	60	6
CHLOE			17	1		3					2					23	4
THAIS and PHRINIAS												8		*		8	2
TIMON'S 1st Serv.			1	1	9		4	*								15	5
TIMON'S 2nd Serv.					7		*	*								7	3
TIMON'S 3rd Serv.					4		*	*								4	3
TIMON'S Messenger	3															3	1
MEL.'S Page or Serv.			1			1										2	2
4 CREDITORS							12									12	1
MASQUERADERS					1											1	1
HERALD and ALC.'S Mess.												1		1		2	2
SOLDIERS														1		1	1
LAMPRIDIUS							*									*	1

present in six scenes, is responsible for thirty-six speeches. In Shadwell's version he makes an appearance in only four scenes but nevertheless pronounces sixty-seven utterances. By introducing Melissa, who on account of her fluctuating mercenary love is involved with both Timon and Alcibiades, Shadwell has added elements of intrigue and conflict which the original badly lacked. Although Alcibiades does not appear until Act III, 2, the dramatist is better able to prepare his entrance by modifying his relationship with the Athenian Senate and by giving a fuller account of this trouble-ridden association. Alcibiades, who is first mentioned by Melissa and Chloe in Act II, 1, has been banished before the curtain rises, thus enabling Timon to ask during the initial banquet scene that the exile be lifted. During this supplication Timon alludes to Alcibiades' probable return to Athens and his presence under disguise in Act III, 2 comes as no surprise. This scene has a dual function since on the one hand it demonstrates the falseness of Melissa's declaration of love to Timon, and on the other hand it prepares the upcoming encounter between Alcibiades and the Senate. During the Alcibiades - Senate scene, Shadwell sheds light both on the controversy involving Alcibiades' friend, Thrasibulus, and on Alcibiades' initial banishment. In the latter case the dramatist has followed much more closely Plutarch's Life of Alcibiades than had Shakespeare. The dramatic impact of this scene has been

increased by delaying it until after Timon's self-banishment, as it is now made to coincide with the turning point in the action of the main plot and serves as the "tragic force in the falling action of the play".[30] Whereas Shakespeare had made Alcibiades' visit to Timon turned misanthrope the first of many, Shadwell again delays the encounter until Act V, 1. The contrast between Timon's tragic reaction and Alcibiades' rational reaction to the ingratitude of Athens is better served by the carefully planned positioning of these two scenes. The final act also achieves a sense of balance and unity since scene one belongs to both Timon and Alcibiades, scene two to Alcibiades, scene three to Timon and scene four (despite Timon's absence) to both of them. In Shakespeare's version this act lacked integration since Timon appeared only in the first scene, Alcibiades only in the last.

The inter-connection of plot and subplot leads to a more dramatic and better constructed dénouement. Evandra's suicide on stage does not defy neo-classical convention. The dramatic value of the play is greatly enhanced by the tragic, yet sentimental nature of Timon's death. Notable by its absence is the scene in which the Soldier discovers Timon, dead and buried. In retrospect, Shadwell has a messenger deliver the inscription which he found when sent by Alcibiades to Timon's retreat, presumably with the intention of notifying him of

Athens' capitulation. This messenger reports that he found Timon and Evandra lying in a tomb, dead but not buried. We are not made to witness this discovery but hear of it at the same time as the characters on stage. Many themes have been incorporated into this final scene. Alcibiades, though principally concerned with overthrowing the five hundred, does nevertheless demonstrate the element of personal revenge which partly motivated his attack on Athens; Melissa's fate is well deserved; Apemantus, who in the original version does not appear in Act V, is arrested by Alcibiades' soldiers for railing against the army and its commander but is subsequently released.

The reworking of the subplot is only one of numerous changes and omissions made by Shadwell in order to achieve a sounder dramaturgic effect. The scenes involving the Strangers, the Banditti and the Fool, the value of which is most questionable in the original form of the tragedy, have been omitted. Such has also been the fate of the buffoonery in which the Lords participated following Timon's farewell banquet. The episode surrounding Timon's servant Lucilius and his desire to marry the Old Athenian's daughter has been linked to the main plot: in Act III, 3 Shadwell has this same servant, renamed Diphilus and wealthy on account of the estate which Timon bestowed upon him, ignore his benefactor when the latter is desperately in need of assistance. The Poet's role has also been slightly amended

by Shadwell. In Shakespeare's version he was responsible for foreshadowing the action of the play; Shadwell has omitted this section from the exchange between the Poet and the Painter, probably, as Francelia Butler has stated, with a view to preserving some element of suspense.[31] In order that the Poet's presence be not restricted to Act I, 1 and Act V, 1, Shadwell has made him responsible for the masque during the initial banquet scene; the presence of the author of the poetry enables Apemantus to resume the criticism he had voiced in the first act.

The dramatic shortcoming of Shakespeare's dependence on accumulation by means of variations on a theme has already been discussed. Shadwell, though still relying on this technique, has increased its value both by restricting its use and by establishing a sound connection in the liaison of scenes. This was the purpose behind the omission of the Banditti from Act IV and the harmonization of Act III. In the original version of this act we witness, in three different scenes, the fruitless attempts made by Timon's servants to borrow money from his friends, the Lords. Flavius reports that he has already taken it upon himself to borrow money from the Athenian Senate. Following the Lords' rebuffs, we are made to observe some creditors' servants in their attempts to have their masters' debts honoured. They approach Flaminius, Flavius and finally Servilius before Timon appears.

During the course of four scenes (309 lines) the movement of the action has come to an absolute standstill. We are made aware of the Lords' rejection of their benefactor and of Timon's inability to satisfy his creditors. By means of numerous alterations Shadwell has enhanced the dramatic possibilities of this act. Since Shakespeare's four Lords and four Senators have been replaced by seven Senators, it is to these Senators that Timon dispatches his servants. The onus of ingratitude is placed more on the Senators than in the original, thus furthering the establishment of a close link between plot and subplot. Moreover, the Senators' refusals occupy only one scene and are rendered more dramatic by the presence of Apemantus and his ensuing cynical yet correct appraisal. In scene three, it is the creditors, not their servants, who approach Timon and their meeting is delayed by only one encounter, in which Demetrius is involved. Not only do the Senators refuse help when accosted by servants, but also in a chance meeting with Timon himself. These encounters, characterized by the constant movement as the Senators enter individually and exchange a few words with Timon before leaving, add to the stagnant action of the original but also demonstrate more fully the ingratitude of the benefactors. Shadwell has done this, while also demonstrating the ungratefulness of Lampridius and Diphilus, in the time it took Shakespeare to demonstrate the Lords' selfishness and Timon's inability to repay his debts. With

a view to completing the theme of ingratitude Shadwell then sheds light on the true nature of Melissa's love for Timon: aware of his misfortune she at first refuses to see him, but when chance has it that they do meet, she turns a deaf ear to his supplication.

Although the dramaturgy of Shadwell's Timon of Athens is sounder than that of the original version, it is undoubtedly not a model from the neo-classical point of view. Whereas the play is framed by a prologue and an epilogue, the latter is spoken in the presence of those characters who remained on stage at the end of the final act. The unities of time and place are not seriously regarded; in fact, the unity of place is violated more often than in the original. Because of the presence of the flirtatious Restoration belle the comic and the tragic have not been totally separated, although the intermingling is less apparent than in the original. In true Restoration fashion, there is little adherence to rules of decorum. Not only does Melissa admit her coquettish desire to have all the "Young Blades follow, kiss my hand, admire, adore me/and die for me" (Act II, p.214), but Apemantus is allowed to elaborate on the actions of the Government which permits:

> Matrons to turn incontinent;
> And Magistrates to pimp for their own
> Daughters.
> Ruine of Orphans, treachery, murther,
> rapes,
> Incests, adulteries, and unnatural sins(Act III, p.231)

Evandra's proposition, that she and Timon live together without marrying, demonstrates a deep disregard for decorum. Such a suggestion entails the denunciation of the sacredness of wedlock and this lies beyond the bounds of classical tragedy.

In altering the structure of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens with the dual intention of improving on the play's dramaturgy and of having it appeal to his Restoration audience, Shadwell has modified the underlying meaning of Shakespeare's work. The Man-Hater is as much a vehicle for the satire of the contemporary scene, as a warning against ostentatious liberty and false friendship. In turn, coquettes, mercenary love, science, sport, the Government, the nobility, in fact all aspects of life in Restoration England are criticized under the guise of Athenian society. With the exception of mercenary love, which is demonstrated by Melissa and exposed by Evandra, the satire is in the hands of Apemantus. Whereas Shakespeare's Apemantus is unsympathetic and motivated by self-indulgence, Shadwell's counterpart, honoured by Socrates, commands the respect of the audience. This differing portrayal is noticeable in the exchange with Timon in Act IV, 3, during which Timon does not curse him to the same extent as in the original, nor does he throw stones at him. In his own speeches Apemantus is less critical of Timon and statements such as "'Tis most just/That thou turn rascal; had'st thou wealth again/Rascals should hav't"

(Act IV, 3), are conspicuous by their absence.

Apemantus' account of the times in which he lives corresponds more to Restoration England than to Athenian society:

> But 'tis a loathsome Age, - it has been long
> Imposthumating with its villanie;
> And now the swelling's broken out
> In most contagious ulcers; no place free
> From the destructive Pestilence of manners.
> Out upon't, 'tis time the world should end! (Act I, p.206)

The responsibility for this state of affairs lies primarily in the hands of the Lords and Senators:

> The Government's to blame in suffering
> the things I rail at.
> In suffering Judges without Beards, or
> Law, Secretaries that can't write;
> Generals that durst not fight,
> Ambassadors that can't speak sence;
> Block-heads to be great Ministers, and
> Lord it over witty men;
> Suffering great men to sell their Country
> for filthy bribes,
> Old limping Senators to sell their Souls
> for vile extortion (Act III, p. 231)

In describing the mainstay of the governing body, the Lord, Shadwell demonstrates both the permissiveness and the satiric objectives of Restoration drama:

> Mean thing! does he not play the fool,
> and eat,
> And drink, and void his excrements and
> stink,
> Like other men, and die and rot so too?
> What then shou'd it be proud of? 'Tis
> a Lord;
> And that's a word some other men cannot
> Prefix before their names: what then? a
> word
> That it was born to, and then it could
> not help it...

> Oh but perhaps he's rich, 'Tis a
> million to one
> There was villany in the getting
> of that dirt,
> And he has the Nobility to have
> knaves for his Ancestors. (Act III, p. 231)

The comparative success which this adaptation experienced during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, would seem to justify the claim made by the author in his dedication to the Duke of Buckingham. By improving on Shakespeare's dramaturgy and by adapting the social criticism to the problems facing his own theatrical audience, Shadwell undoubtedly made Timon of Athens more pleasing to his London spectators. The proven need for further adaptations does, however, demonstrate that this version was successful only in so far as it met the needs and desires of its contemporary audience.

III

ADAPTATIONS BY LOVE AND CUMBERLAND

"Since Mr. Garrick's Management, the Stage is become the School of Manners and Morality; Ribaldry and Prophaneness are no longer tolerated. Sense and Nature exert their Influence...and the British can now vie with the Athenian Drama, when in its Severest State of Purity".[32] This eighteenth century reaction to the immoral stage productions of Restoration England, which it was thought represented a corrupt society, is manifest in both adaptations of Timon of Athens which followed Shadwell's. James Love (James Dance) and Richard Cumberland, by adopting some similar, some differing measures, were concerned with the upgrading of Shakespeare's and Shadwell's versions of Timon of Athens both by improving on the play's dramaturgy and by upholding certain standards of decorum. The versions of both playwrights, who from a technical point of view appeared to have partly fulfilled their underlying purpose, were nevertheless outright failures when performed.

Contemporary critics were no more impressed by these alterations than was the general public. Writing in 1780, Thomas Davies says of Cumberland's adaptation:

> Those who have read Shadwell's Timon will not, I believe, scruple to prefer it

> to Mr. Cumberland's, though both alterers had better have forborn a task to which they were unequal. It is almost impossible to graft large branches upon the old stock of Shakespeare; none have succeeded in their alterations of that poet, but such as have confined themselves to the lopping off of a few superfluous boughs, and adding, where necessary, some small slips of their own, and that too with the utmost caution... It is indeed a miserable alteration of one of Shakespeare's noblest productions.[33]

Arthur Murray is more blunt: "What Mr. Cumberland did to such a play, or how he contrived to mangle it, is now not worth the trouble of enquiring".[34] George Odell, commenting on the play's advertisement in which Cumberland announces his desire to "have brought the Play upon the Stage with less Violence to its Author and not so much responsibility on my own Part"[35] asks "what, except vanity, prevented his doing so?"[36] That Cumberland's version aroused more interest than Love's[37] is due in part to the fact that David Garrick produced the play, though not without reservations, as is evident in this letter to the adapter, dated February 5, 1769:

> I have read Timon over very carefully and think, that the Alterations have great Merit in the Writing part, but as they don't add greatly to the pathos of the Play and break into Its Simplicity, I really believe that the Lovers of Shakespeare would condemn Us for not giving them Timon as it Stands in the Original - I think that excellent rule for Writing as it is laid down by Horace <u>Simplex et Unum</u> was never more verify'd than in Shakespeare's Timon: I could

> have wish'd that the same hand which
> has alter'd Timon, had been Employ'd
> upon a less Meritorious Play. 38

This unfavourable reception was primarily due to the wholesale alterations which the original text underwent at a time of intense admiration for Shakespeare. The ensuing regard held for Shakespeare by the Romantics demanded a return to the original form of his dramas, a function which in the case of Timon of Athens was to be performed by George Lamb.

Both Cumberland and Love demonstrate the prevailing concern centered on the refinement of manners. In this regard the differential is understandably greater between their dramas and Shadwell's, though Shakespeare's Timon is also deficient in this respect. In improving on the decorum of their predecessors both dramatists realized the necessity of cutting and altering certain of Apemantus' speeches (Shakespeare: Act I, 1 200-1; Act IV, 3 363-7; Shadwell: Act II, p. 207 and most of his railing against society, Lords and Government). Both playwrights, by omitting Shakespeare's scene involving Apemantus and the Fool, likewise delete all references made by the Fool in the original to whoring. Furthermore, Cumberland has eliminated the roles of Alcibiades' two whores, while Love has purged them of such references to venereal disease as these:

> Phrynia.- Thy lips rot off!
> Timon.- I will not kiss thee; then the rot returns
> To thine own lips again.(Act IV, 3 64-66)

Timon.- Art thou Timandra?
Timandra.- Yes.
Timon.- Be a whore still. They love thee not that use thee.
Give them diseases, leaving with thee their lust.
Make use of thy salt hours; season the slaves
For tubs and baths; bring down rose-cheek'd youth
To the tub-fast and the diet.(Act IV, 3 84-8)

In Love's version, the omission of the coquettish Melissa is in itself an attempt to observe the rules of decorum. Similarly, Evandra does not offer to become Timon's mistress, nor does she threaten to stab herself. In true neo-classical fashion, Love does not have Timon and Evandra execute their lethal intentions on stage; Cumberland's Timon dies a quiet death on stage, but whether or not this death is natural remains unsaid. The reworking of the initial banquet scene also aims at a refinement of manners. In Shakespeare's Timon the Folio stage directions following the masque of the Amazons read "The Lords rise from table, with much adoring of Timon, and to show their loves each singles out an Amazon, and all dance, men with women, a lofty strain or two to the hautboys, and cease".[39] Reference to Cupid, the Amazons and the subsequent dance is omitted by both Love and Cumberland. The former substitutes a masque of Shepherds and Nymphs, the latter a "grand dance...to martial musick" (p.9) in honour of Alcibiades.

The change in attitude towards crudity and blasphemous statements during this epoch is well demonstrated in the revision undertaken by Love and Cumberland of Timon's

TABLE III

LOVE'S TIMON OF ATHENS

ACT	I		II				III						IV			V				TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	1	2	3	4		
TIMON	27	20		26				6	14		5	2	1		72	28		7		208	11
LUCIUS	3	6	4			9					8	*								30	6
LUCULLUS	5	5			6						8	*								24	5
SEMPRONIUS							2					*								2	2
APEMANTUS	27	13													29					69	3
ALCIBIADES	1	4								12					19		3		4	43	6
FLAVIUS	1			10			2	3	4					2						22	6
FLAMINIUS				1	6				2					2					1	12	5
SERVILIUS	3			*		7		5						1						16	5
POET	20							7			5	*				15				47	5
PAINTER	18							5			5	*				17				45	5
JEWELLER	6							14			4	*								24	4
CAPHIS			3					19												22	2
PHRYNIA															3					3	1
TIMANDRA															5					5	1
EVANDRA				15					8					2	20			7		52	5
MASQUERS		1																		1	1
LUCULLUS' Serv.					3															3	1
GENTLEMAN						3														3	1
1st SENATOR										10		*				8	4		2	24	5
2nd SENATOR										4		*				6	2		2	14	5
1st SOLDIER																4				4	1
2nd SOLDIER																	1			1	1

soliloquy which comprises Act V, 1 of the original. Both sexual and religious allusions, such as the following, have been discarded:

Timon.-

To general filths
Convert, o'th'instant, green virginity!
Do't in your parents' eyes...
Religion to the gods...
Thou cold sciatica,
Cripple our senators, that their limbs may halt
As lamely as their manners! Lust and liberty
Creep in the minds and marrows of our youth,
That 'gainst the stream of virtue they may strive,
And drown themselves in riot! Itches, blains,
Sow all the' Athenian bosoms, and their crop
Be general leprosy! (Act IV, 1)

The initial procedure in improving the dramaturgy of the original lay in altering the portrayal of Timon. In Shakespeare, Timon's generosity is self-centered and ill-considered. His subsequent downfall and change of heart consequently suffer by failing to arouse the necessary sympathy. A comparison of the references made to Timon by Alcibiades during his final speeches indicates more than the sentimental value attached to his death which Francelia Butler has noted in the renovators' dramas;[40] due to the different working-up of Timon's character, the impact created by his death must differ. The Romantic critic Schlegel states that "Timon was a fool in his generosity; in his discontent he is a madman".[41] Though unable to change this trait of Timon's character completely without rendering the original

incompatible with their own versions, Love and Cumberland have reduced this self-destructive characteristic by some carefully planned omissions. Neither dramatist has Ventidius offer to repay the money which Timon had lent him in order that he might be released from prison. Consequently, lines such as the false maxim "there's none/ Can truly say he gives, if he receives" (Act I, 2) are omitted and Timon's benevolence appears more meritorious. A similar effect is achieved by limiting the presents which he bestows upon his false friends. Neither renovator has Lucius present Timon with four white horses, harnessed by silver ornaments; both also remove Lucullus' invitation to hunt. These omissions result in the absence of Timon's foolish reaction "let them be received/Not without fair reward" (Act I, 2). The giving of a bay courser to Sempronius is deleted by both playwrights for the same reason. Furthermore, Love has omitted the Steward's declaration in Act II, 2 which concerns itself with Timon's folly and part of the exchange between the Lords in the initial act:

> Second Lord.- He pours it out. Plutus the
> god of gold
> Is but his steward. No meed
> but he repays
> Seven-fold above itself: no
> gift to him
> But breeds the giver a return
> exceeding
> All use of quittance. (Act I, 2)

For his part, Cumberland has omitted much of the Poet's

speech in Act I, 1 in which he refers to his allegorical painting (43-65, 80-85).

Like Shadwell, Cumberland's principal amelioration lies in his handling of the subplot. This he does in a manner which, paradoxically, is both similar and dissimilar to Shadwell's. Shadwell had used the coquettish Melissa and her fluctuating love in interconnecting the main and the subplot; by altering the intrigue, Cumberland utilizes both Evanthe and the Lords to achieve this same end. The mercenary love is present in the characters of Lucius and Lucullus, who, at the onset, are Alcibiades' adversaries in their attempts to win over Timon's daughter, Evanthe. Just as Melissa had done in Shadwell's drama, these two Lords abandon Evanthe upon recognition of Timon's poverty. Alcibiades, as did Evandra, remains constant and helpful when most needed. The importance of his encounter with the Senate has been downplayed; they meet in a street, whereupon Alcibiades is told that he has been banished on account of his ill-tempered demand that help be granted to Timon. Whereas Shadwell had increased the importance of the Alcibiades-Senate subplot and had utilized Melissa in linking it to the main plot, Cumberland has decreased the importance of the former and, by intimately linking Alcibiades to Timon's daughter, has in fact made plot and subplot into one.

The dramaturgy of these variations, though in some aspects superior to Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, is in

other cases inferior and imperfect. Such a case in point is demonstrated by Love's handling of the Alcibiades subplot. Despite the introduction of a female character, Love has failed to establish the necessary link. The same objections which have been raised to the original in this regard are equally valid in Love's drama. The links have been further weakened by a reduction in the role of the Senators. These Senators, who number only two, do not appear until Act III, 4. The nature of this encounter with Alcibiades is consequently less justifiable than in Shakespeare where all the Senators had appeared at least once prior to this scene; the omission of the creditors' servants' initial encounter with Timon has also necessitated the absence of Alcibiades from this scene, a deletion which has further reduced the preparation for Alcibiades' encounter with the Senate. This reduction in the Senators' importance also proves detrimental to their relationship with Timon. They are not seen benefiting from his benevolence and since their refusal to help him must be judged as an act in their official capacity, not as a question of true ingratitude, Timon's misanthropic behaviour towards them appears ill-founded. Love's treatment of Melissa is also found to be lacking. Despite the fact that she never appears, she is a character who disappears as the action progresses. Melissa has no connection with Alcibiades as Love has only borrowed from Shadwell certain details concerning her love intrigue with Timon. Following

the report of her refusal to help Timon in Act III, 3, she disappears from the picture since no reference is made to her thereafter.

The blocking for Cumberland's version of Timon of Athens suggests that the roles played by the Poet and the Painter, which had been previously increased by Shadwell and Love, have been drastically reduced by him. Their presence is restricted to Act I in which they forecast the action of the play and serve as objects against whom Apemantus demonstrates his cynic philosophy. Shakespeare, whose use of these characters had also been found deficient, had at least reintroduced them in Act V, 1. The importance of Apemantus has been diminished by both Love and Cumberland. Numerous cuts are justifiable in that they do not correspond to the decorum of the time; others, such as Apemantus' absence from the dénouement, an improvement introduced by Shadwell, prove detrimental. Cumberland, by omitting the initial banquet scene, has deleted numerous railing speeches; furthermore, the contrast which had been established between Apemantus' grace and Timon's subsequent one has also been lost.

Both renovators demonstrate the disregard for the unities of time and place which their predecessors had exhibited. The Soldier in Love's Act V, 2, who is there to replace Shakespeare's faithful Flavius, is out of place. The dénouement in this version is found to be as lacking as the

TABLE IV

CUMBERLAND'S TIMON OF ATHENS

ACT	I				II					III						IV		V		TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	1	2	3		
TIMON		23		14					18					10		9		24			13	111	7
ALCIBIADES		1		4				4	5				3		1			11	9		5	43	9
APEMANTUS		21	7															7				35	3
FLAVIUS				4					8		*			7			3	7			2	31	7
LUCIUS			6	7		3	5	1	*			11								11		44	8
LUCULLUS			6	5			5	2	*	6										9		33	7
1st SENATOR	*	*		*	4										1	12	3		6			26	8
2nd SENATOR	*	*		*											1	12	5		4			22	7
3rd SENATOR	*	*		*												8			2			10	5
POET	12	6																				18	2
PAINTER	12	2																				14	2
JEWELLER	3	4																				7	2
MERCHANT	3	3																				6	2
FLAMINUS									1	6	3			3								13	4
CAPHIS					3				9											8		20	3
SERVILIUS									1			1		1								3	3
HORTENSIUS														2								2	1
VARRO									4					5								9	2
TITUS														10								10	1
LUCIUS														13								13	1
PHILOTAS														5								5	1
PHOCION																	1					1	1
SOLDIER				1					*										10			10	1
TIMON'S Serv.		1																				1	2
TIMON'S Mess.		3																				1	1
VENTIDIUS' Mess.										3												3	1
LUCULLUS' Serv.				1		3		5			5	11	3			13		5		11		57	9
EVANTHE									3									1				1	1
ISADORE																							
SENATE'S Mess.																							

original. Flaminius, who appears out of nowhere since the dismissal of Timon's servants in Act IV, 2, is now in Alcibiades' service and replaces the Soldier from the original. Whereas we are spared the discovery of the dead, Flaminius' inability to read recalls the Soldier's presence in Act V, 3 of the original. Nor has Love avoided technical faults such as Shakespeare's premature reference to the Poet. In Act V Love has the Poet say to the Painter: "'Tis said he gave his steward a mighty sum" (Act V, 1); this Shakespearean line ought to have been omitted since the encounter between Timon and Flavius, during the course of which Timon gave him part of his wealth, is missing in this adaptation.

The series of reworkings of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens come to a full cycle with George Lamb's version,[42] first staged on October 28, 1816. This adaptation, which had only seven performances, is an attempt to restore the play to its original author, with the exception of omissions deemed necessary by the refinement of manners. To this end Lamb has not only removed all elements of feminine interest previously introduced by the other renovators, but, like Cumberland, he has removed Alcibiades' two mistresses. Consequently, the following reference to whoring is avoided:

> Phrynia, Timandra.- Give us some gold, good
> Timon: hast thou more?
> Timon.-Enough to make a whore forswear her
> trade,

> And to make whores a bawd. Hold
> up, you sluts,
> Your aprons mountant. You are
> not oathable,
> Although I know you'll swear,
> terribly swear
> Into strong shudders and to
> heavenly agues
> Th'immortal gods that hear you...
> Be whores still;
> And he whose pious breath seeks
> to convert you,
> Be strong in whore, allure him,
> burn him up;
> Let your close fire predominate
> his smoke,
> And be no turncoats: yet may your
> pains, six months,
> Be quite contrary. (Act IV, 3)

Other omissions, all of which had previously been omitted by one or more of his predecessors, have the underlying purpose of improving on the play's dramaturgy: the Strangers; the Poet and the Painter in Act V; the Soldier's discovery of Timon; Apemantus and the Fool. The dénouement has likewise been adapted to include, as in Cumberland's version, the fate of the Lords.

In improving the manners Lamb has deleted the dance between the Amazons and the Lords which initially followed the masque. The blocking indicates a further reduction in Apemantus' role; missing from the first banquet scene are the denunciations of women and flattery (Act I, 2 127-41; 233-51). The exchange with Timon in Act IV, 3 is similarly cut to exclude such statements as:

> Apemantus.- Thou art the cap of all the
> fools alive.
> Timon.- Would thou wert clean enough
> to spit upon!

TABLE V

LAMB'S TIMON OF ATHENS

ACT	I		II		III						IV		V		TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	1	2		
TIMON	33	25		18			11		9	1		38	17		152	8
LUCIUS	6	4				10			5					2	27	5
LUCULLUS	6	3			6				10					3	28	5
APEMANTUS	29	9										19			57	3
SEMPRONIUS		4				2			14					1	21	4
ALCIBIADES	1	1		*				11				15		9	37	6
FLAVIUS		4		14	6	2	6				3		11		46	7
FLAMINIUS	3	1		1		8	3				2				18	6
SERVILIUS		2		1							2				5	3
CAPHIS			2	11			19								32	3
VARRO				6			15								21	2
PHILO							6								6	1
1st SENATOR	*					3		9	*				6	5	23	6
2nd SENATOR	*		3					3	*				4	3	13	6
POET	17														17	1
PAINTER	16														16	1
JEWELLER	6														6	1
MERCHANT	6														6	1
OLD ATHENIAN	10														10	1
TIMON'S Mess.	3														3	1
LUCULLUS' Serv.					3										3	1
AMAZONS		*													*	1
1st THIEF												5			5	1
2nd THIEF												2			2	1
SOLDIER														1	1	1

Apemantus.- A plague on thee...
Timon.- All villains that do stand by thee are pure.
Apemantus.- There is no leprosy but what thou speak'st.
Timon.- If I name thee.
I'll beat thee, but I should infect my hands.
Apemantus.- I would my tongue could rot them off!
Timon.- ...thou issue of a mangy dog! (Act IV, 3)

Whereas the pruning of Apemantus' speeches may be justified, this is not the case with Timon's. Leigh Hunt has noted how the removal of Timandra and Phrynia has affected the meaning of Shakespeare's work, since "many of the most striking pieces of satire are left out".[43] The abatement of Timon's invective, most notable in his soliloquy in Act IV, 1 has a similar outcome.

The unsuccessful attempts by dramatists to improve the play by ameliorating its dramaturgy would seem to signify that if Shakespeare did leave this play unfinished upon realizing the inherent impossibility of successfully applying the theme to dramatic tragedy, it is just another indication of his dramatic ability and insight.

IV

BRECOURT'S TIMON

While Shadwell's adaptation of Timon of Athens was encountering sustained success, a comedy also based on the Timon story was making its debut on the French stage. Paradoxically, one of Brécourt's more successful plays, Timon,[44] first produced on August 13, 1684, was to bring about his death: "Son jeu était tellement animé, qu'il se rompit une veine en jouant dans sa comédie de Timon qu'il voulait faire réussir au moins par l'action. Il mourut de cet accident, en 1685".[45] In dealing with De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope and the English translation thereof, Francelia Butler states that "no evidence has been produced to indicate any relationship whatsoever between these plays and Shakespeare's".[46] The same is true of Brécourt's Timon which simply attests "French recognition of Timon as a dramatic subject".[47] Not only does the nature of Brécourt's play, Lucianic both in source and substance, exclude any connection between this play and Shakespeare's, but so does the state of unawareness which prevailed in seventeenth century France with regards to Shakespeare and his compatriots, a situation which was to be drastically altered by the middle of the following century.[48]

It is not due to chance that a subject matter which furnished Shakespeare with a five act tragedy, should be rendered by Brécourt into a one act comedy. H.C. Lancaster[49] emphasizes that the decade from 1680 to 1690 witnessed the resurgence of comedy as the leading dramatic genre, a position which it had lost on account of Racine's continued output following Molière's death. Of the forty comedies recorded during that decade, twenty-three are of one act and as such they conform to the "growing insistence upon having a longer play followed by a 'petite comédie'".[50] Jacques Scherer, in dealing with the classical period in its entirety, further differentiates one, three and five act comedies: "La comédie est en cinq actes lorsqu'elle est ambitieuse: elle emprunte chaque fois qu'elle le peut la coupe du 'grand genre', la tragédie. Quand sa portée est moindre...trois actes lui suffisent; elle se fixe à trois parce que la comédie italienne, à qui elle doit parfois beaucoup, a trois actes. Enfin si elle n'est qu'un divertissement de circonstance...ou bien si...elle dérive de la farce qui ignorait l'entr'acte, elle se contentra d'un acte".[51]

In accordance with the classical norm, Brécourt's Timon consists of an exposition, an obstacle, peripeteia and a dénouement. The exposition, which is composed of Timon's soliloquy and Jupiter's conversation with Mercury, presents a dual conflict: Timon wants to avenge the ingratitude which his friends have demonstrated, Jupiter desires to restore

Timon's wealth. The obstacle, in both cases Timon's reluctance to accept gold from the gods, is overcome once Plutus has persuaded him that it was not money, but rather Timon's own stupidity which brought about his downfall. The second conflict is solved when Timon agrees to accept Jupiter's gift. The first conflict is solved when Timon turns away all the suitors who have flocked to him since Jupiter has made them aware of his reinstated wealth. The play could have ended here, but by depicting Timon as becoming suddenly ungrateful and impious, Brécourt emphasizes the second conflict and annexes a spectacular dénouement to this Lucianic development of the action.

French classical influence on Timon is evident prior to the beginning of Act I, 1: the dramatis personae presents the characters not in the order of their appearance, but in a hierarchical format.[52] Brécourt's handling of the three unities is also characteristic of French classical theory. The unity of time is observed in the strictest sense since the duration of the performance represents precisely the time of the action; despite the unreasoned dénouement, the action of the play is unified. The unity of place proves more problematic: whereas the action revolves around two different locations, the heavens and a locality near Athens, it is perfectly feasible that Jupiter, Mercury and Plutus descend to earth during the represented time of action. Timon then abides by Jacques Scherer's initial definition concerning

the rule of l'unité de lieu: "la scène ne devra représenter que les lieux où les personnages peuvent vraisemblablement se rendre pendant le temps que dure l'action".[53] It fails to qualify according to his second definition: "le lieu... devra reproduire exactement le lieu unique et précis où l'action est censée se passer...Il est 'contraire à la vraisemblance qu'un même espace et un même sol... représentent en même temps deux lieux différents'."[54] This dilemma, caused by the necessary subordination of locality to the unities of time and place, themselves dependent on elements of verisimilitude, is typical of French classical drama. Consequently, the unity of place has never been observed to the same extent as the other two unities. Scherer, after asking whether any plays do exist which observe this rule "avec toutes ses exigences", concludes that "il y a des pièces classiques qui respectent rigoureusement l'unité de lieu, mais en fort petit nombre".[55]

The question of verisimilitude in Brécourt's Timon is not only hindered by its dependence on the public's knowledge of Roman mythology, but also by the attempts to fulfill the spectator's desire for spectacular events. On two occasions the stage directions demonstrate the spectacular features which no doubt pleased the public, but nevertheless prove to be utterly implausible: Plutus' departure in Scene 4 is followed by explicit directions for the appearance of Timon's second fortune: "Plutus s'en va et il se leve peu à peu de

dessous terre une grosse Montagne d'Or" (Scene 4, p. 19). Timon's downfall in Scene 9 is similarly spectacular: "La montagne d'Or et Timon abîment ensemble" (Scene 9, p. 35). The dénouement is thus deficient from the point of view of verisimilitude, but of greater importance is the fact that the verisimilitude of the play as a whole is hampered by the implausibility of Timon's denunciation of the gods which alone brings the play to an end. Brécourt has taken the theme of impiety from Lucian but has drastically altered the emphasis. In the original, Timon does not himself demonstrate impiety and the ending is consequently relatively happy for him. One is led to believe that his initial decision, "I will buy up this desert corner, and build a tiny castle for my treasure, big enough for me to live in alone, and, when I am dead, to lie in",[56] is fulfilled. A comparison of Timon's first speech, a monologue in both works, demonstrates the inherent difference.Lucian's Timon, who describes more the impiety of man than his misdeeds, does not ask that his personal enemies be punished, but rather that Zeus preoccupy himself with re-establishing respect and piety where impiety has surfaced. Brécourt's Timon, though simultaneously denouncing mankind's impiety, is more concerned with retribution:

> Timon.- Daignés punir au moins les ingrats qui m'oublient...
> O grands Dieux vengez-moy de tant d'hommes ingrats (Scene 1, pp. 4-5)

These lines, the latter of which is repeated at the beginning of Scene 2, set the stage for the theme of ingratitude to be reintroduced at the end of the play. Suddenly, at the end of Scene 8, the shift from the impiety which Timon had witnessed in mankind to his own display of irreverence is inserted:

> Timon.- Et qu'ai-je à redouter, une montagne d'Or
> Met à couvert de tout, armé de ce tresor,
> Je ne crains les humains, le sort, ny les
> Dieux-méme.(Scene 8, p. 30)

only to be reaffirmed more emphatically during his final speech in Scene 9:

> Timon.- Je ne reconnois plus les hommes ny les
> Dieux,
> Je ne voy que mon Or, mon Or est mon
> idole. (Scene 9, p. 34)

Timon's unexpected turn-about has produced mixed reactions. On the one hand, "there seems little reason for Timon's turning against Jupiter, who had answered his appeal, so soon after he has been enriched",[57] while on the other hand "le dénouement...n'est pas difficile à imaginer".[58] The former opinion is more convincing since it is highly unlikely that a person who has not only seen but also suffered from the misuse of wealth should proclaim its omnipotence. Brécourt goes one step further in having the protagonist denounce the gods. The motive for this innovation can be none other than the desire to bring about a spectacular ending. No thematic cause for Timon's behaviour has been given: in Scene 4 he renounced his belief that the gods were responsible for his poverty; nor does Timon blaspheme in the

heat of the moment. Verisimilitude has been sacrificed to the spectacular.

The blocking for Timon exhibits a fundamental difference between French classical drama and Shakespearean plays. The French dramatists, in an attempt to establish a paragon distinctive by its precision and simplicity, deemed necessary a reduction in the overall number of characters. Consequently, in dramatizing the Timon story, Brécourt has decreased to a quarter the number of characters presented by his English predecessors. Of the eleven dramatis personae, seven appear in only one scene. All are episodic characters, and, with the exception of Poverty who flanks Timon during Scene 4, all are his false friends. Two of the remaining characters, Jupiter and Plutus, appear in only two scenes, the former at the beginning and at the end of the play, the latter when he is made aware of his mission (Scene 3) and when he fulfills it (Scene 4). In all but the final scenes, which comprise the dénouement and the added feminine intrigue, these characters play a role which is little other than a dramatization of Lucian's Timon. The primary difference between the original and Brécourt's play is brought out by the two leading characters, Timon and Mercury (Hermes). In this regard the blocking for the play is somewhat misleading since Mercury's role appears to be more important than the protagonist's. A comparison of the number of lines which they respectively speak, rather than the number of speeches,

TABLE VI LES FLATEURS TROMPEZ OU L'ENNEMY DES FAUX AMIS

SCENE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES	TOTAL LINES
JUPITER		10								1	11	2	
MERCURE		9	8	24	2	2	3	6	5	1	60	9	188
PLUTUS			9	5							14	2	
TIMON	1	1		21	4	6	10	5	3	*	51	9	276
LA PAUVRETE				3							3	1	
GANTON					6						6	1	
PHILIADES						4					4	1	
L'ORATEUR							11				11	1	
LE PHILOSOPHE								7			7	1	
PARTENICE									8		8	1	
THAIS									6		6	1	

does, however, indicate that Timon holds the stage longer than does Mercury: his role consists of two hundred and seventy-six lines, compared to Mercury's one hundred and eighty-eight. The principal difference between the two Timons has previously been mentioned, but Brécourt's Timon's impiety is even less explicable upon comparing the initial description of him given by Mercury/Hermes in both works. In Lucian, Hermes explicitly states that Timon's folly, more so than his friends' behaviour towards him, was responsible for his downfall:

> Hermes.- Why, if you like to put it so, it was kindness and generosity and universal compassion that ruined him; but it would be nearer the truth to call him a fool and a simpleton and a blunderer. (pp. 33-4)

Mercury, in conversation with Jupiter, is less explicit:

> Mercury.- C'est en faisant du bien à des amis ingrats,
> Qu'il acabloit d'argent, de plaisirs, de repas...
> Eh! le pauvre Timon (Scene 2, p. 7)

Such an ellipsis is not in conformity with Mercury's subsequent role. Unlike Lucian's dialogue in which Hermes leaves for heaven once Timon has accepted Plutus' gift, Mercury remains on stage to witness and comment on Timon's behaviour. Timon's newly devised philosophy, which entails being as cruel to mankind as possible, results in the following reaction: "Oh! Oh! voilà déjà les efets du Tresor" (Scene 4, p. 21). The manner in which Timon treats Gnaton

also draws criticism from Mercury:

Mercury.- De les estropier je ne te vois
pas chiche,
Et tu commence bien à faire l'homme
riche (Scene 5, p. 23)

Mercury's role does not, however, only entail criticizing Timon; the latter's false friends are also under close scrutiny. In turn, Philiades, the Orator, the Philosopher, Partenice and Thais are the objects of his satire:

Mercury.- Il le faut écouter, ces gens
ont des paroles,
A convertir le vent quelque
fois en Pistoles. (Scene 6, p. 25)

L'exorde est magnifique, et
par cette methode,
On enrichit un homme à chaque
periode. (Scene 7, p. 25)

A ce dégoust de l'Or que tu semble
sentir,
N'est-tu point l'Occean qui
voudrois l'engloutir. (Scene 8, p. 28)

Oh le parfait amour! oh le
rare tresor!
Cela peut s'appeller la pureté
de l'or. (Scene 9, p. 33)

Equally important as his role of clearly discerning hypocrisy and flattery is Mercury's attempt to keep in rein Timon's reaction. The dramatic outcome of this task provides the only element of sustained comedy throughout the play. With the exception of Plutus' description as to how he disposes of his wealth, the comic element of the drama is restricted to Timon's pursuit of his flatterers. In some cases they attempt to protect themselves by hiding behind Mercury

(Scene 7, p.27); the chase then revolves around him. In other cases Mercury intercedes to prevent Timon's violent onslaught (Scene 5, p.23; Scene 8, p.30; Scene 9, p.34).

The drawing of the moral in Timon, a feature of French classical drama, is the dual responsibility of Jupiter and Mercury:

> Jupiter.- Péris avec ton Or, et fais
> ainsi connoistre,
> Que l'on ne doit jamais
> s'attaquer à son Maistre.
> Mercury.- Exemple à qui ne sçait user
> de ses tresors,
> Profitez en, bon soir,
> imitez-moy je sors.(Scene 10, p.35)

At regular intervals during the play Shakespeare's Apemantus is brought to mind both by Mercury and Philiades. The latter's declamatory statements in Scene 5 are such a case in point, though the resemblance ends where the motivation begins.

It is surprising that Timon, which observes all rules of classical decorum, was able to enjoy the limited success that it did. Despite the general disregard for unity of place, there must be some truth in Boileau's famous words:

> Qu'en un lieu, qu'en un jour, un
> seul fait accompli
> Tienne jusqu'à la fin le théâtre
> rempli.[59]

The limited success cannot have been earned either by the verisimilitude or the comic elements of the play. A comedy in name alone, Timon is to say the least "surprisingly gloomy".[60] Brécourt, who chose a theme which was well-suited to the decaying morals of the decade, had to decide between

satisfying his contemporary public's taste for spectacular events and fulfilling their desire for verisimilitude. His decision, surprising in that he was writing for the Comédie-Française, not the Théâtre Italien, resulted in seventeen performances during the first five months, but none thereafter.

V

TIMON AT THE THEATRE ITALIEN

Brécourt's Timon was performed by the Comédie-Française. Subsequent treatment of the Timon story was to be handled by their archrivals of the Théâtre Italien. Arlequin Misantrope, first produced on December 22, 1696, has been preserved by Gherardi in his Théâtre Italien.[61] Attributed independently to both Brugière de Barante and Louis Biancolleli,[62] this play enjoyed a very limited success.[63] Following the return of the Italian comedians in 1716 under the direction of Luigi Riccoboni, Lélio, Arlequin Misantrope was played eight times.[64] Henri Lagrave wrongly states that its production on June 13, 1726 marks the last time that the Nouveau Théâtre Italien dipped into the coffers of l'ancien répertoire.[65] This practice, dictated by the desire of the majority of spectators, was to last several more years as is indicated by the last recorded acting of Arlequin Misantrope, dated October 14, 1731.[66] Lucianic in source, all that is kept of the original dialogue is that the protagonist, disgusted with mankind, has fled to a wood. By comparison, Louis François De Lisle de la Drévetière's Timon le Misantrope,[67] which remained more faithful to its source, was to prove the most successful play of the first half of the eighteenth century. De Lisle's play, which had

"brought Paris seventy crowded Nights together",[68] was last performed on July 24, 1768;[69] by 1750 it had been played at least one hundred and seventy-seven times,[70] a success which overshadows any play written by Marivaux for the Théâtre Italien or any play performed by the troupe of the Comédie-Française. The success of Timon le Misantrope was undoubtedly furthered by the other attractions which the Hôtel de Bourgogne offered. Gustave Attinger stresses the importance of firework displays and divertissements in attracting spectators to the Théâtre Italien: "Il est remarquable de constater que, pendant plusieurs années, les feux d'artifice furent le principal attrait de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne...On étoffe d'anciens canevas avec des pantomimes et des divertissements. On opère de même avec les pièces du répertoire français... Ainsi, en juillet 1746, après quelques représentations médiocrement suivies du fameux Timon de Delisle, les Registres du Théâtre annoncent: 'Timon et ses agréments', et en août: Timon le misanthrope et le ballet; et le public accourt".[71]

Arlequin Misantrope, one of the plays that "messieurs les auteurs apelloient comedies françoises accommodées au théâtre italien" is also one "de celles où la troupe étoit obligée (pour se conformer au goût et à l'intelligence de la plûpart de ses auditeurs) de faire insérer beaucoup

plus de françois qu'elle n'y mettoit d'italien".[72] The author has observed the unity of both time and place. The entire action, in which the time represented is identical to the duration of the production, is presented in a wood. In keeping with the Théâtre Italien the action of the play is loosely structured around a conflict: Octave, worried by his guilt at having misled Colombine into believing that he is a count, has deserted her; the latter, motivated by her undiminished love, pursues him with the hope of a reconciliation. Added to this intrigue is Arlequin's subsequent love for Colombine and the concealed father-son relationship between Octave and the Doctor. However, of the twenty-two scenes in this three act play, only six are in any way connected with this intrigue. The majority of scenes reveals that the emphasis resides in the satirical depiction of contemporary Paris. Despite the fact that Arlequin does to some extent provide a link between these two levels of interest, and that the love intrigue demonstrates one aspect of the decaying Parisian society, one would have difficulty in upholding that Arlequin Misantrope is unified in its action.

The blocking for the play effectively brings forth the dual nature of the action. Nineteen of the twenty-six characters each appear in one scene only. These characters, together with Mme de l'Architrave who is present during two

TABLE VII

ARLEQUIN MISANTROPE

ACT	I					II								III							TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
SCENE	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
ARLEQUIN	1	29		16	33	14	6	5	6	16	11	11	16	7	15	18	14	19		11	8	8	264	20
OCTAVE			23				6	4											9			2	44	5
COLOMBINE		30						1						6					5	8	4	5	59	7
LE DOCTEUR					21			*														2	23	3
SCARAMOUCHE			23		8														7	4		1	43	5
PIERROT									6														6	1
Mr DISANVRAI				15																			15	1
Mad. DE L'ARCHITRAVE													13			19							32	2
MEZZETIN																						1	1	1
LA COMTESSE						12																	12	1
LE CHEVALIER						8																	8	1
UN VIEILLARD									11														11	1
SA FEMME									9														9	1
DEUX GASCONNES											12												12	1
UN PEINTRE																		20					20	1
UN LIBRAIRE																	15						15	1
Mr DE COLAFON												11											11	1
FILS DU DOCTEUR					4																	1	5	2
FILLE DU DOCTEUR					*																		*	1
JACQUET																					5		5	1
MACINE																					9		9	1
Mr DE GERESOL														17									17	1
Mr DE LA CABRIOLE														17									17	1
5 ESPAGNOLS					1																		1	1
LE MASON													3										3	1

scenes, are representative of the society which caused Arlequin to turn man-hater. In their conversation with him, they bear the brunt of his vindictiveness. The remaining cast, dominated by Arlequin who has two hundred and sixty-four of the six hundred and forty-two speeches in the play, is comprised of the stock characters of the commedia dell' arte: Colombine, Scaramouche, Octave and the Doctor.

Arlequin's role in Barante's play is original: first, he never assumes a disguise in order to trick anyone; second, he is presented in a "novel mask of moral indignation"[73] which necessitates that he assume the personality of a famous philosopher who has withdrawn from society because of its incorrigible state. In the Prologue, Arlequin objects to the role which has been assigned to him: "Non vraiment, un misantrope est un homme d'esprit, une fois, et tout le monde sait que je ne suis qu'un sot" (p. 462). This objection proves justified when in Act III, l he loses sight of the role he is playing and, in true Arlequin fashion, declares his passion for Colombine. The Prologue, which assumes the form of a dialogue between Arlequin and Colombine, presents certain important conjectures concerning dramaturgy. Both characters strongly emphasize the importance of improvisation. Colombine clearly states the purpose behind comedy: "Heureux, si nous avions pû atteindre à ce but qui doit être la seule fin de la comedie, de corriger les moeurs en divertissant l'esprit" (p. 465).

Arlequin's insistence, despite Colombine's disagreement, that he cannot portray un homme d'esprit, is particularly relevant since this change in characterization had been an innovation brought forward on the stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. As well as introducing the theme of the play, "le plan de satyre que nous allons vous donner" (p.465), the practice of announcing the play to the spectators is also emphasized. Despite the reputation of the Italian comedies, the only rupture with the rules of decorum occurs during this prologue when Arlequin declares: "Vous êtes une salope" (p.463).

The intermingling of Italian (Act II, 3, 8; Act III, 7, 9), dialect (Act I, 5; Act II, 6), singing and dancing (Act I, 5; Act II, 6, 7; Act III, 9) and even versification (Act III, 1) is a common feature of productions by the Comédiens Italiens du Roi. Dialect had been a part of Italian productions since about 1530, when Ruzzante, probably under the influence of Plautus, introduced it.[74] The elements of song and dance evolved from the pressure placed on the Italian actors to adapt to their French-speaking audience.[75] The most pronounced difference between comedies presented by the Italian comedians and their French counterparts during the last decade of the seventeenth century resides in the type of comic, the jeu: "Jeu français, jeu italien...la comédie noble et la farce, la comédie apprise et la comédie

improvisée, le théâtre officiel et le théâtre libre, l'artifice et le naturel...Jeu italien, cela revient à dire théâtre vivant ou théâtre tout court, à l'encontre de théâtre mort et de théâtre qui n'est point théâtre; cela ne signifie ni farce, ni impromptu, ni même naturel, mais présence réelle, vie et feu".[76]

The jeu, the movement, the comic retorts, in a word, the action of Arlequin Misantrope, is typical of the Italian comedy to which the spectator at the Hôtel de Bourgogne was accustomed. The end of Act II, 3, which was undoubtedly improvised by the actors, is outlined by Gherardi: "Octave veut secourir Colombine, Arlequin l'en empêche et emmene Colombine. Octave reste fort embarassé. Le Docteur vient, qui le reconnoit pour son fils. Octave feint de ne pas le connoitre et s'échape. Le Docteur le suit. Après cette scene, qui est toute en italien, Arlequin revient sur le théâtre" (Act II, 3). The comical exchange between Arlequin and M. de Colafon, an ex-dancing instructor turned fencing instructor in spite of a wooden leg, brings about another jeu, this time a fourberie gratuite:"Le maitre à danser presente un fleuret à Arlequin, qui le refuse d'abord, et le prend enfin. Après avoir escrimé quelques momens, le maitre à danser sort un pistolet, et fait rendre la bourse à Arlequin, et s'en va" (Act II, 7). Throughout the play the emphasis is on action and acting: Scaramouche, who in Act I, 3 is relating Colombine's reaction to her lover's

departure, is filled with mock sentimentality. Following his third outburst of tears, one can well imagine the acting which accompanied the following narration:

> Scaramouche.- Et sur le champ elle se leve du lit. Oh, pour celui-là il est trop plaisant, il rit, prend les porcelaines de sa cheminée, les jette à terre, prin; rompt les tableaux, crac, renverse les meubles, ouvre la fenêtre, et se jette....
> Octave.- Où, Scaramouche?
> Scaramouche.- Dans un fauteuil.(Act I, 3)

In contrast to the repertoire of the Comédie-Française, the productions by the Italian comedians showed a total disregard for verisimilitude. This is best exemplified by the importance attached to the spectacular nature of their comedies, a feature that proved as pleasing to the eye as the incessant action. Act I, 1, sets the pace with the appearance of various animals to whom Arlequin addresses himself. Subsequent aspects of the spectacular are often indicated by stage directions at the end of scenes:

> On ouvre, et on voit un grand cabinet illuminé. Il est soutenu par quatre mores vêtus de gaze d'or. Il y a dans chaque niche des figures richement vêtues. Les violons jouent une chaconne...Les figures du cabinet se détachent, et font une danse de postures. (Act I, 5)

> Madame de l'Architrave se retire, et en même temps tous les massons qui l'accompagnoient, bâtissent, en dansant, un magnifique palais...La chanteuse sort du palais, avance sur le theatre, et chante...Tout le palais se détruit. (Act II, 8)

> Le tableau change. Une femme paroit devant une table pleine de bouteilles de ratafia. Elle a une pipe à la bouche et un verre à la main...On voit un petit Arlequin dans le tableau qui salue, descend, chante et s'en va. (Act III, 5)

However, as Lancaster has pointed out,[77] the chief emphasis of the play lies in the satire, not in the spectacle. The beau monde de Paris, and in particular its women, are most often ridiculed, but little is ignored in this criticism which deals specifically with the nation's capital. Each in turn, authors, booksellers, comedians, the opera, magistrates and even church authorities are the object of the author's satire.[78] In fact, the only link between the play and its counterpart in Restoration England is the prevailing impact of satire on the contemporary scene. Shadwell's coquettish Melissa had her counterpart in Paris during the late seventeenth century and it is to the latter that Arlequin addresses himself: "je ne croyois pas que depuis feue Artemise de constante memoire, aucune femme eût aimé plus de vingt-quatre heures" (Act I, 2). Arlequin's satirical statements are often coupled with sarcasm, a device which proves fruitful, since the characters to whom he addresses himself are incapable of discerning it. Such a case in point occurs repeatedly during his conversation with la Comtesse and le Chevalier, as in the following passage:

> La Comtesse.- Puis-je, dites-moi, dans une solitude, me levant à midi, être jusqu'à deux heures à ma toilette, parmi mille

nuances de just-au-corps rouges et bleus qui me réjouiroient la vue?

Arlequin.- Vraiment, on sait bien que vous ne pourrez pas comme certaines femmes, destiner les differens jours de la semaine aux differentes professions, et donner le lundi aux gens de robbe, le mardi aux abbés, le mercredi aux étrangers, et le reste de la semaine au public.

Le Chevalier.- Vous voyez donc bien, monsieur, que madame a raison, et que vous n'avez rien à répondre? (Act II, 1)

Condemnation of Parisian society is not placed solely in the hands of Arlequin. Shakespeare's Apemantus finds his mate in M. Disanvrai, but the resemblance is confined to the latter's displeasure with society:

> Paris est à peu près de même que vous l'avez laissé: les hommes y sont fourbes, avides, âpres à l'argent, peu sensibles aux loix de l'honneur, et sacrifiant tout à leur interêt. Les femmes sont prudes au dehors, et galantes au dedans; les vieilles se fardent, les jeunes minaudent. Il y a moins de jaloux que de cocus. (Act I, 4)

Disanvrai is not cynical, nor does he attack Arlequin for his misanthropic behaviour. He is in total agreement with this famous philosopher whose retreat is never a topic of debate.

De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope, first produced on January 2, 1722, was immediately acclaimed as representing a new type of comedy, a comedy "qui a été inconnu aux anciens et aux modernes, et qui ne ressemble à rien qu'on a vu jusqu'à présent. Tout est simple, naïf, et la métamorphose est employée avec tant d'art qu'elle fait sortir la vérité toute

nue du sein de la nature, et le comique de la nature et de la vérité".[79] Towards the end of the century, Antoine d'Origny was to express himself in similar terms: "Le Public ne pouvoit recevoir de plus jolies étrennes que la premiere représentation de Timon le Misantrope, Comédie de de Lisle, aussi sagement intriguée que purement écrite".[80]

De Lisle, who had previously written Arlequin Sauvage, discloses in Timon le Misantrope how an author must write comedies:

> Socrate.- Il faut dire spirituellement des choses raisonnables et des veritez utiles pour la correction des mœurs; faire rire les honnêtes gens par un comique sensé, qui reçoive toutes ces graces de la nature et de la verité; éviter sur tout les pointes triviales, la fade plaisanterie, les jeux de mots et toutes les licences qui blessent les moeurs et révoltent l'honnête homme (Act II, 5)

This exposition is not to be seen purely as an expression of De Lisle's theory, but also as "l'apologie du nouvel Arlequin, et du théâtre rénové par Lélio".[81] In achieving this model, De Lisle has altered the stress of the Timon story; the emphasis is no longer on Timon's misanthropic philosophy, but rather on the successful attempt to reconcile him with humanity. For the first time in the stage history of Timon the blocking reveals that Timon himself is not the principal character. This position has been taken over by Arlequin, the metamorphic donkey who, guided by the will of the gods, is responsible for converting his master. Arlequin's

TABLE VIII

TIMON LE MISANTROPE

	PROLOGUE			I							II							III						TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6		
TIMON	1	9	27				5	10	24		11	1	8											138	14
MERCURE		7																1	7	24	6	4		14	2
ASPASIE				1		9				36							4					7		50	4
PLUTUS		3																						3	1
ARLEQUIN			27				9	9	25	35			8	1	54	10	4		8	30	4	4	1	229	15
EUCHARIS					1	9		9			11										5	*		35	6
IPHICRATE							2																	2	1
CARICLES							4																	4	1
SOCRATE															54									54	1
MAITRE d'armes																4								4	1
MAITRE à chanter																5								5	1
MAITRE à danser																3								3	1
UN FLATTEUR																				10				10	1

Number of scenes: 23

Number of one speech scenes: 7

Number of scenes with two characters: 9

natural and simple essence and qualities which he has retained from his previous state, are the primary causes of his success.

The introduction of a new conflict has enabled De Lisle to attach great importance to the philosophic dimensions of the play. Seen by some as a forerunner of Jean-Jacques Rousseau[82], the author of Timon le Misantrope has endowed Arlequin with a simple mind, the kind one associates with a donkey. This intellect, despite its dependence on learning from its own mistakes, is superior to mankind's. Social satire, though reduced in importance, is nevertheless present. During Arlequin's meeting with Socrates, he wishes to buy himself glory and noble ancestors, but in the end, it is the animal instinct in him which enables him to see the futility of false pride:

> Socrate.- O dieux! un âne sent la vanité
> de ces choses, tandis que nous
> voyons tant de gens qui, méprisant
> l'ordre de la nature, veulent
> être descendus des ancêtres qu'elle
> n'a pas jugé à propos de leur
> donner. (Act II, 5)

The danger residing in Arlequin's dependence on simple, clear reasoning is brought forward by the episode involving the theft. De Lisle has protected himself from his critics on two fronts. First, Arlequin is persuaded to rob Timon by the forces of magic, not by Aspasie's (Mercury's) reasons: "un choeur de passions le charme de ses incantations et l'entraîne dans un ballet".[83] Previously, while agreeing with the logic

behind Aspasie's argument, he nevertheless doubted its verity: "je sens quelque chose là dedans, qui me dit que cela n'est pas bien" (Act I, 7). Aspasie then elaborates: "La nature, encore toute simple en lui, le dirige sur les voyes de la verité, sans même qu'il la connoisse" (Act I, 7). De Lisle, who thought it necessary that he further defend this act, does so in a Preface: "ce vol n'est donc qu'un jeu de Mercure, qui n'a qu'un objet de charité pour Timon" (p.3). Arlequin must then be judged as the executor of the divine will.

The philosophic nature of Timon le Misantrope, which has led Hugo Humbert to consider it as the original Ruhrdrama[84], does, however, prove to be detrimental to the action of the play. The blocking indicates that of the twenty-three scenes, seven are monologues, while nine others involve only two characters. To the reader, if not to the spectator, the play takes the form of a somewhat artificial sequence of dialogues, "et ces dialogues, si ingénieux qu'ils soient, peuvent dérouter le spectateur ou le lecteur, en confiant tour à tour le jeu d'une dialectique semblable à des personnages différents: Timon et Arlequin,- Arlequin et Mercure,- Arlequin et Socrate".[85] Fortunately, the play was written for the Italian comedians who alone would have been able to make such a success out of it. Though less rich in lazzi than most of the Italian repertoire, there can be little doubt that the play's success was largely due to the acting

of Thomassin and Lélio, the former playing Arlequin, the latter Timon. The only real jeu occurs at the end of Act II, 6:

> Le Maître d'armes et le Maître à danser campent Arlequin de maniere qu'il semble qu'il va tout à la fois faire des armes et danser, ce qui fait d'abord un jeu par la seule attitude; ensuite le Maître à chanter lui fait chanter la notte. le Maître à danser fait la cabriole, le Maître d'armes pousse une botte. Arlequin chante, fait la cabriole et pousse la botte tout à la fois; les Maîtres repetent la même chose avec précipitation, Arlequin s'éforce pour les suivre, et il s'essouffe de maniere qu'il se met hors d'haleine, ensorte qu'il tombe épuisé par les efforts qu'il a faits. (Act II, 6)

Gustave Attinger correctly emphasizes that there are numerous instances where it is evident that De Lisle kept in mind the theatre for which he was writing: "il est clair que le style a toutes sortes d'inflexions plus subtiles, manifestement destinées à nos Italiens. La scène de la naissance d'Arlequin, dans Timon, est calculée sur le jeu de Thomassin. La vivacité des attaques lui convient parfaitement".[86] The songs and dances which end each act are also written exclusively for the Théâtre Italien. These ballets are filled with motion, and despite the roles played by the Passions, the Flatterers and Truth, none other than Arlequin himself remains the focal point of attention.

All rules of classical decorum are observed by De Lisle in this drama. This is a common trait of the Nouveau Théâtre Italien, which aimed at purging itself of anything that would

in any way attract the criticism from which its predecessor had suffered. The rules of unity of time and action are similarly adhered to, if not the unity of place. The subject of verisimilitude is dealt with specifically in the play:

> Socrate.- Je dirai d'abord que votre sujet est trop métaphorique pour le Théatre qui veut du vrai-semblable en toutes choses..
>
> Arlequin.- Qu'importe, pourvû que je ne dise que des choses vraies et raisonnables. (Act II,5)

The criterion for judgement should not be verisimilitude in an abstract sense, but rather the question of whether or not the meaning and instructive nature of the drama is true to life. Arlequin's moral, which is brought out in Act III, 6, supports the message which De Lisle has been emitting throughout the play.

With one exception, this play has little in common with any of the other dramas based on the Timon story. The exception concerns Shadwell's Timon in which one finds the counterpart of Eucharis. Both Evandra and Eucharis love Timon and offer him the small fortune which they have at their disposal; in both cases Timon refuses because he finds himself unworthy of them. In Timon le Misantrope it is not until his fortune has been restored that he consents, at Mercury's insistence, to marry Eucharis. There is an element of irony in the relationship shared by Timon and Eucharis since he only shows interest in her once she has begun to act in a manner which is contradictory to her nature. The difference between appearance and reality has

been avoided, not exploited as in other cases.

There can be little doubt that such a highly acclaimed play,[87] following his Arlequin Sauvage, should have made its author better known to posterity than is the case. As it is, the play's success ran a path parallel to the success of the Nouveau Théâtre Italien. With the disappearance of the Italian troupes, the play's basic flaw, and with it that of De Lisle, must have come out into the open. Timon le Misantrope, with its predominance of one on one and one speech acts, was written specifically for the Italian comedians; these actors alone would have been capable of extracting from these scenes movement and dramatic interest. Such scenes are not used by De Lisle as a means of revealing strong emotions; rather, they serve the function of demonstrating the advantages of a simple, animal-like mind. Without the kind of acting which the comédiens italiens supplied, Timon le Misantrope becomes a philosophical dialogue which, in form, closely resembles Lucian's Timon, a satiric dialogue.

VI

DESTOUCHES' LE DISSIPATEUR

The success of Destouches' Le Dissipateur,[88] even though it surpassed that of all other French dramatizations of the Timon story, was nevertheless short-lived. Last performed in 1851, only two hundred and fifty-five representations have been recorded since its debut at the Comédie-Française on March 23, 1753. Though previously played in the Provinces in 1736,[89] the comedians in Paris had at that time refused to perform Le Dissipateur and Destouches chose instead to have his play published. La Harpe proves to be as critical of this drama as he is of Destouches' entire repertoire: he considers it as a "canevas si vicieux" which Destouches "n'avait pas osé risquer...de son vivant".[90] In an attempt at being more objective than La Harpe, Geoffroy endeavours to account for the delay between the play's publication and its initial appearance at the Comédie-Française:

> Peut-être le role de l'honnête friponne, de cette Julie qui ruine son amant pour le sauver, effraya-t-il le goût timide des comédiens de ce temps-là...peut-être l'héroïsme du valet Pasquin, et le désespoir tragique de son maître, leur parurent-ils peu convenables au bon genre de la comédie. S'ils avaient reçu et joué la pièce en 1736, il était très-possible qu'elle éprouvât une disgrâce,

> le public n'étant pas encore tout-à-fait assez mûr pour de telles inventions; mais quand ils jouèrent Le Dissipateur, en 1753, l'art avait fait en dix-huit ans de grands pas vers sa décadence: la friponne honnête, le valet héros, firent la fortune de la pièce. Les succès du théâtre sont très-subordonnés aux temps et aux lieux, et dépendent singulièrement des circomstances. 91

In his Preface to Le Dissipateur Destouches has claimed complete originality for his play; he has simultaneously attempted to belittle Molière in whose footsteps he was following: "L'avare et le dissipateur sont deux contrastes parfaits: Molière s'est emparé du premier; non seulement c'étoit le plus facile et le plus brillant, mais Plaute lui en avoit fourni le sujet et les traits les plus vifs et les plus comiques...je n'ai travaillé sur aucun modele: j'ai fait choix de mon sujet, j'en ai formé le plan, et c'est la nature qui me l'a fourni." (p.307) In the light of this, it is surprising to note that Le Dissipateur owes a great deal to plays written by four other authors: Shakespeare, Shadwell, Regnard and Plautus. Since Destouches was in London from 1717 to 1723, a period during which Shadwell's Timon was performed several times at Drury Lane, it is understandable that the first connection between the English and French dramatizations of the Timon story should be detectable in his writings. Although Shakespeare's Timon of Athens was probably never performed during these six years, there are numerous indications in Destouches' play that he must at least have been acquainted with the Folio text. In the

Examen du Dissipateur of Petitot's edition, the thematic similarity which exists between both plays is revealed. There are, however, many more cogent parallelisms between Destouches' Dissipateur and Shakespeare's "production informe et barbare".[92]

The most striking resemblance is evident in the roles played by the servants, the Steward and Pasquin. Both servants warn their masters about their precarious financial situation; in both instances they are told to sell their masters' belongings, including their land. Their vehement reaction to their masters' uninterrupted dissipation would seem to suggest that Destouches owes a great deal to Shakespeare:

Steward.- No care, no stop; so senseless of expense (Act III, 1)

Pasquin.- Quel éclat! quel fracas! quelle diable de vie! (Act III, 1)

Once Cléon has fallen, Pasquin again acts like the Steward in wanting to remain by his master's side;[93] the resemblance is even greater in that not only do both servants offer their masters whatever money they have, but they are also both dismissed. Timon is likewise brought to mind when Géronte demonstrates his approval of Julie's plan by exclaiming:

Géronte.- Je remarque
Qu'une femme prudente, et qui se donne au bien,
Vaut cent fois mieux qu'un homme. (Act IV, 1)

The change which Shakespeare's Timon of Athens has undergone

at the hands of Destouches is brought out when one realizes that Apemantus' assessment of Timon, "the middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends" (Act IV, 3), is equally applicable to Cléon. Just as Timon's reaction to his friends' ingratitude was misanthropy, so is Cléon's reaction to avarice, dissipation. Apemantus' ability to discern the falsity of Timon's friends is similarly present in the words of the Baron:

> Le Baron.- Votre folie attire
> Chez vous mille flatteurs qui mangent votre bien,
> Et vous planteront là quand vous n'aurez plus rien:
> Ils vous vendent bien cher de basses flatteries,
> Tandis qu'ils font de vous cent fades railleries. (Act I, 7)
>
> On vous flatte aujourd'hui,
> Et jusques au besoin on vous promet merveilles;
> Mais s'il vient, parlez-leur: ils n'auront plus d'oreilles. (Act III, 10)

The heated exchange between Apemantus and Timon turned misanthrope is also evoked by Destouches. In this instance it is the Marquis, a character who recalls Apemantus and who has an affiliation to Cléon similar to that of Apemantus to Timon, who is involved.

Destouches' indebtedness to Shadwell is most apparent in the parallelisms which exist in the feminine intrigue. Like Shadwell's Timon, Cléon has to choose between the sincere, honest love which Julie offers him and that which the coquettish Cidalise embodies. Cléon's decision is

somewhat hampered by the oftentimes deceitful appearance of Julie, but nevertheless Cidalise's lack of modesty in his presence should render his choice as clear-cut as Timon's.[94] As it is, he follows Timon in making the wrong choice. This similarity has led Margaret Gilman to assert that "such borrowings as there are were very evidently made not from the Timon of the First Folio, but from Timon 'made into a play' by Shadwell".[95] The exclusion of Shakespeare as one of Destouches' primary sources appears unjustified; since Shadwell did not follow Shakespeare in giving Timon a loyal servant, the similarity between Pasquin and Shakespeare's Steward is left unaccounted for.

A close resemblance between Le Dissipateur and Regnard's Le Joueur is revealed when the form of the opening dialogue between Finette and Pasquin (Act I, 1) is compared to the exchange between Nérine and Hector in Regnard's play (Act I, 2). Not only does the love intrigue prove to be similar as the plot of both plays develops, but so does the role of the servants. Another of Regnard's plays, Le Retour Imprévu which in turn is based on Plautus' Mostellaria, also proves to be a source for Destouches. As is the case in Le Joueur, the person on whom Cléon is financially dependent is made to believe that the young man has changed his ways. In an attempt to divert Géronte, Finette and Pasquin devise a plan which is taken directly from Le Retour Imprévu; when confronted with the Baron, they again revert to the trick

which Merlin played on Géronte and Mme Bertrand.

In the Preface to Le Glorieux, Destouches elaborates on what the purpose of comedy must be: "l'art dramatique n'est estimable qu'autant qu'il a pour but d'instruire en divertissant...Quelque amusante que puisse être une comédie, c'est un ouvrage imparfait et même dangereux, si l'auteur ne s'y propose pas de corriger les moeurs, de tomber sur le ridicule, de décrier le vice, et de mettre la vertu dans un si beau jour qu'elle s'attire l'estime et la vénération publiques".[96] This tendency towards a comedy of character which was moralizing, instructive but also amusing was an inevitable feature of the Comédie-Française during this period: "Ainsi coupée du bas comique qu'elle laissait aux folles rhapsodies des forains, la Comédie-Française prétendra au monopole de la forme et de la pensée; elle opposera le vers à la prose coupée de vaudevilles, et au divertissement d'intrigues folles, l'étude plus nourrissante des caractères. En bref, elle subordonnera de plus en plus le rire à l'instruction et à la morale".[97]

Despite the inherent difficulty involved, Destouches has observed the rule of the three unities. That this should be one of his primary concerns is not surprising considering his denunciation of his English contemporaries: "car il est presque impossible d'exprimer les énormes libertés que les auteurs comiques se donnent en Angleterre: ils ignorent, ou plutôt ils méprisent les trois unités, et se moquent de nous

qui les observons si soigneusement. Loin de se borner à une seule action, trois ou quatre à peine leur suffisent... Non seulement la scène change à tous les actes, mais souvent plusieurs fois dans le même acte; d'où il s'ensuit que les décorateurs anglois sont encore plus en mouvement que les acteurs".[98] In order to adhere to the unity of time the author has had to depict Cléon on the verge of disaster[99] and, as he states in his Preface, "ce n'est que par des récits que j'ai rempli mon sujet" (p.308). This remark is reinforced by the blocking for the play which indicates that exactly half of the scenes (ten during the first two acts) involve no more than two characters. Conversations between Julie and Finette, Finette and the Comte, Cléon and the Comte, and Julie and the Comte introduce the spectator both to Cléon's inevitable downfall and to the nature of the love intrigue. The unity of place has been observed in its wider application since the action takes place inside and outside Cléon's residence. Destouches' deep respect for classical dramaturgy is evident in the close attention that he has paid to the liaison des scènes.[100] Every scene ends either with the departure of a character or before the appearance of another character; every time that a new scene begins, there is at least one person present who was on stage when the preceding scene ended. With one exception, the division into acts also conforms to classical demands. Géronte, the Baron and Julie are all on stage during the

TABLE IX

LE DISSIPATEUR

ACT	I									II									III										
SCENE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
LE BARON																													
GERONTE							18																						
CLEON																								22	4	*	2	1	3
LE MARQUIS			13	18		3	16	3	13		23			14	10	9	6				23	5	21	12	5	2	7	3	7
LE COMTE									15															22	8	3	*	*	4	
FLORIMON		15	5	4	2	3	3	3							10	7	6	11								5	3	5		
CARTON																												5	1	
JULIE	11																											3	1	
CIDALISE										27	11	6	11															2	1	
ARSINOE															16		10	5												4
ARAMINTE																												2	1	
BELISE																														
PASQUIN	12			8																								1	2	
FINETTE	13	11	15		17					27	23	6	7						1	15	20		15	9	2			1	1	
			IV										V							16	13	4	5	2	*				

	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	TOTAL SPEECHES	TOTAL SCENES
LE BARON	4	6																				68	11
GERONTE	8	13						6	2													106	11
CLEON		14	10	4	3	2					3	2	8	3	6	2	2	3	5	8	4	244	33
LE MARQUIS															7	2						37	6
LE COMTE																			6			81	14
FLORIMON						2											1	2				7	4
CARTON	7	3	9	5													2					7	4
JULIE				8	3	2		1	6	1											3	120	16
CIDALISE													5	3	4							44	9
ARSINOE																	3					6	3
ARAMINTE																	3					6	3
BELISE																	4					6	3
PASQUIN							1	6	*	7	1	1	10							7		89	9
FINETTE																						144	23

final scene of Act III; Act IV begins with these same characters but to a certain extent Destouches has safeguarded himself against criticism since the division into acts allows a period of time to elapse, in the course of which Géronte is understood to have changed his will.

One of Destouches' major achievements in Le Dissipateur has been his ability to preserve a unified action in spite of the numerous conflicts which he presents. The initial conflict is centered on Julie's desire to marry the hero: she must bring about his complete ruin, but she must also make him realize that Cidalise is a flattering, self-centered coquette. A second conflict derives from the Comte's aspirations for Julie, a desire which sets him up against his friend and benefactor, Cléon. The final clash opposes the spendthrift and the miser, the one being dependent upon the other. The contrast which this final conflict depicts has been judged as "ce qu'il y a de meilleur et de plus plaisant dans le Dissipateur".[101] Cléon is involved in all three intrigues, and he together with the meneur du jeu, Finette, comprise the unifying link in the play's action. Despite the fact that Destouches has presented a unified action, a basic inconsistency is apparent in his handling of the initial conflict. Julie receives one hundred thousand francs; in return she promises not to tell her father that her husband-to-be has sold his estate:

Cléon.- Voici cent mille francs en billets
au porteur.

Finette.- Ils sont bons?
Julie.- Oui, très bon, et j'en suis satisfaite.
Cléon.- Et voici de quoi rendre une fille muette.
Finette.- La dose est-elle forte?
Cléon.- Oui, cent louis.
Finette.- Enfin, J'ai trouvé pour mon mal un savant médecin... Prenons donc son remede...Ah! je me sens guérie! Et vous, madame?
Julie.- Eh! mais...
Cléon.- Oh ça! sans raillerie, Sommes-nous bons amis?
Julie.- Il le faut bien, Cléon.
Cléon.- Vous ne direz donc rien à monsieur le Baron?
Julie.- Soyez tranquille. (Act II, 4)

This method which Julie has devised in order to precipitate Cléon's downfall is completely artificial: since she is a widow, her future lies in her own hands and her father ought not to interfere. At the very least, one expects the fears which Cléon has demonstrated to bring about a reaction from the Baron when his daughter tells him that she now possesses Cléon's land, his jewellery and his money; instead, the disclosure proves anticlimatic since the Baron does not even comment on his daughter's initiative.

Disapprobation of Le Dissipateur has commonly been focused both on the play's lack of verisimilitude and on its lack of decorum. Destouches' personal opinion with regard to the necessity of both is unclouded: "Peindre est l'objet de la comédie: si les figures qu'elle représente aux yeux des spectateurs ne sont pas parfaitement ressemblantes, le plus

richecoloris ne sauroit empêcher que les connoisseurs ne les trouvent mauvaises" (p.311). In the Preface to Le Tambour Nocturne he voices dissatisfaction about the decorum of English dramas: "Le ridicule y est merveilleusement copié; le vice n'y est que trop bien représenté; mais on l'y représente comme une mode suivie par les gens d'esprit et de bon goût: c'est le bon air des principaux personnages; en un mot, nulle bienséance...On ne verra point ces libertés si blâmables dans la comédie que je donne au public".[102] The concern over verisimilitude in Le Dissipateur presents two differing arguments. On the one hand La Harpe claims that "le fond du Dissipateur est si essentiellement faux, que le bon sens ne peut s'empêcher de le rejeter. Quelle idée que celle d'une femme qui, pour corriger son amant de sa prodigalité, projette de s'emparer de toute sa fortune, et en vient à bout dans un jour! Quel homme a jamais perdu, dans une partie de jeu avec sa maîtresse, argent, billets, contrats, meubles, carosse, hôtel, enfin tout ce qu'il possédait?"[103] On the other hand Geoffroy has more convincingly argued that eighteenth century dissipators did often bring about their complete collapse in about one day; however, they did not ruin themselves by excessive gifts, but rather by false speculation: "ils se ruinent en fausses spéculations, en entreprises téméraires: s'ils tombent dans la pauvreté, c'est en essayant de faire fortune; et ce qu'il y a de pis,

c'est qu'ils dissipent le bien d'autrui beaucoup plus que le leur".[104] The question of verisimilitude in this case leads directly to the concern over decorum. Not only does Julie's character appear strange and in defiance with her sex, but so does her gambling which initiated La Harpe's criticism. If on the one hand she was willing to risk her fortune with a view to gaining Cléon, she must be considered as imprudent as he is; if on the other hand she knew that she could not lose, if she cheated, a rupture with the rules of decorum is inevitable. In either case the model of virtue which Destouches claims to have created has been degraded.

The weakness of Cléon's character, both as a dramatic hero and as a human being, proves to be a principal defect in the play. Neither his character nor his predicament is comical. For some time before the action begins Cléon has been made aware of his financial situation; Pasquin even says that his master had for a short period of time moderated his spending only to be won over again by flattery. His life is in the hands of the Comte who regulates his spending and also influences Cléon in decisions concerning love. From the onset, Destouches' portrayal of Cléon is weak: a comedy of character which is to achieve its goal should deal with the head of a family; in the case of Le Dissipateur, Cléon's downfall is only of critical importance to himself.

The absence of comedy throughout the play, with the

exception of the episode which has been borrowed from Le Retour Imprévu, is reflected in the dénouement. Destouches, who in this play has demonstrated an inability to unite instruction and laughter, relies on elements of pathos to create his final effect: "Essayer de faire pleurer quand on n'a pas assez de talent pour faire rire, c'est une supercherie qui ne fait pas d'honneur à Destouches; c'est réussir en fraude".[105] However, the ending is happy since Cléon's suicide is averted and the traditional marriage takes place. Several problems are nevertheless brought to light by the dénouement. First, Cléon's attempted suicide is not in keeping with his character; his final collapse does in fact result from the letter brought to him by Pasquin which announces the shipwreck of his vessel, and with it the loss of his treasure.[106] Cléon's reaction to this news, "Et mon dernier espoir périt dans la tempête" (Act V, 14), indicates that his unwarranted response to Julie's alleged infidelity would not have occurred had the letter not been delivered at this time. Since there has been no previous mention of the treasure which he expected, the letter assumes the form of a deus ex machina and enables the pathetic ending to take place. The end result is that the dénouement does not derive naturally from the action of the play. What is natural, however, is that Destouches was inevitably obliged to resort to sentimentality in the ending: "En restant toujours de bon ton, de ton diplomatique,

la comédie instruit par la tirade, la maxime, le dénouement, et jusque par l'attendrissement mouillé des larmes, puisqu'il faut, vu le but, que nous plaignions les personnages ou leur pardonnions".[107]

Throughout Le Dissipateur criticism is aimed at contemporary society. If the spendthrift's faults are eventually corrected, the same is not true of the miser. Both Géronte and the Baron represent this particular stereotype and in keeping with Molière's handling of the comédie de caractère their philosophy and status remain unaltered at the end of the play. Similar treatment is reserved for the coquettish Cidalise and Cléon's entourage of false friends. The Comte's relationship to Cléon enables Destouches to satirize the contemporary scene:

> Le Comte.- Aujourd'hui les amis ne sont plus
> à la mode.
> Les hommes sont unis par le seul
> intérêt:
> L'amitié n'est qu'un nom. (Act I, 3)

Destouches' satirical depiction of a magistrate led to the suspension of the play for twenty years.[108] Nor do the learned escape criticism; in Géronte's words, "J'ai fait l'expérience,/Mon neveu, qu'un docteur est souvent un grand sot" (Act III, 5). The brunt of the satire is, however, leveled at the spendthrift and it is Destouches' desire to reform this character which best demonstrates the shortcomings of his dramatic theory.

The importance which Destouches has attached to virtue

necessitated an abrupt turn-about in the protagonist's behaviour. The moralistic nature of Le Dissipateur reaches its peak in the last scene when Cléon finally sees the light:

> Cléon.- Adorable Julie!...Ah! Vous me percez l'ame!...
> J'adorois vos appas; votre vertu m'enflamme:
> Elle me fait mourir de honte et de regret! (Act V, 15)

The principles which Destouches felt obliged to follow created a problem which he was not able to solve: "le poète comique, dès qu'il se propose avant tout un but moral, est amené à mettre au premier plan les personnages vertueux. Il se condamne par là à la gravité".[109] In spite of this, Le Dissipateur held the stage for about a century. This success must have been due both to the name he had made for himself with his Philosophe Marié and his Glorieux, and to the prevailing policy of the Comédie-Française which demanded above all, that comedies be instructive, moralistic and bienséantes.

CONCLUSION

The stage history of the Timon story on both the English and the French stages, together with an analysis of the plays concerned, points directly at the incompatibility of the subject matter and the dramatic genre. The author's preference for comedy or tragedy did not in itself result in his play's failure or success. Shadwell's Timon and De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope were both very successful when performed for their contemporary audiences, yet neither play proved to have sufficient merit to survive the type of drama which they represented. The absence, until Destouches' Le Dissipateur, of any connection between the English and French dramatizations of this classical legend further strengthens the conjecture that neither Timon nor his life lend themselves to drama: the English dramatists show their indebtedness to Plutarch by depicting Timon both before and after his fall; the French playwrights, notably Brécourt and De Lisle, demonstrate an obligation to Lucian by restricting the action to Timon turned misanthrope.

Reworkings of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens indicate the dual intentions of the renovators: they saw the necessity of improving on the dramaturgy of the original and they also wanted to adapt the play to meet the expectations of their contemporary audiences. Only two adapters, Cumberland

and Love, seem to have realized the innate weakness of the play and tried half-heartedly to solve the problem. In both cases these authors have made Timon appear less foolish than he is in the original with the hope of arousing the audience's sympathy. Nevertheless Timon remains an example of excess, an extremist and an absolutist with whom any member of the audience must find it impossible to sympathize.

The unfinished state of Shakespeare's drama led the adapters to try to integrate the action of the play more closely. To this end scenes were omitted, changed in sequence and assigned to different characters. Even George Lamb, whose intention it was to restore the text to Shakespeare with only those omissions necessitated by the refinement of manners, fell back on further alterations. With the exception of this dramatist, the principal alteration consisted of inserting a love plot, the presence of which had a dual purpose: while making the play more acceptable to Restoration and eighteenth century audiences, this also enabled the authors to establish a clearer link between the subplot and the play's principal action. Eighteenth century concern over decorum is demonstrated by Cumberland and Love; the former playwright has also altered the dénouement, thereby reassuring the audience and introducing an element of poetic justice. However, whether in reference to the original or any particular adaptation, Leigh Hunt's criticism still holds true:

> the parts of this tragedy which contain the dramatic interest are comparatively few; the moral, though strong, is obvious, and in fact too easily anticipated; and when Timon has once fallen from his fortunes, there is little to excite further attention in the spectacle. The reader is still delighted, but he would be still more so in his closet, where he could weigh every precious sentence at leisure, and lose none of the text either by the freaks of adapters or the failure of actors' voices. 110

Of the French dramatists, only two adhered to the classical outline; the difficulty encountered by the English dramatists proves equally formidable to their French counterparts. Brécourt's Timon, more tragic than comic, proved to be a failure; De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope, famous in his day yet unknown today, owed its success more to the Italian troupe for whom it was written and to the play's philosophic content than to its dramaturgy. The insurmountable problem of dramatizing the story of Timon, a squanderer turned misanthrope, has been sidestepped by both Brugière de Barante and Destouches. Barante does not show his protagonist as a reckless spender and has in fact made him misanthropic in name only. The threads which link this play to other Timon dramas are very thin.

The Timon theme, though still present in Le Dissipateur, has undergone a great change; the trend towards the embourgeoisement of French theater productions is evident. Destouches' protagonist is no longer a middle-aged noble;

the Timon of classical literature, and with him his conflict with the Athenian Lords and Senators, have been replaced by the domestic problems of a young, free-spending bourgeois. A similar development, though less pronounced, is apparent in De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope. Whether or not Destouches, who must certainly have been acquainted with Shakespeare's text, consciously realized the inherent shortcoming of Timon of Athens and consequently chose to depict his hero only as a spendthrift, will always be open to debate. However, of all the Timon plays, this one proved to be the most successful over a period of one hundred years, despite the conflict which its moralistic essence has brought about between comedy and virtue. Destouches' Timon is only half as stupid as his predecessors: he is a spendthrift who brings about his own ruin, but he does learn from his mistakes and is able to reconcile himself with the world. This reworking of the principal character is coupled with the introduction of a new theme: whereas lavish spending had always been considered by the nobility as particularly noble, Destouches turned the theme in the direction of the problem of the youthful spendthrift whose reckless generosity could be both comic and tragic to a century of bourgeois spectators. These two innovations cannot have been incidental in making Le Dissipateur more successful than any other Timon play on either the English or the French stage.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Giles E. Dawson, "A Bibliographical Problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare," The Library, 4th ser., 22 (1942), 25-33.

[2] George Lamb, Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, As Revived at the Theatre Royal, Drury-Lane, On Monday Oct. 28, 1816. Altered and Adapted for Representation (1816; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1972).

[3] Hermann Ulrici, Shakespeare's Dramatic Art, trans. L. Dora Schmitz (London: George Bell and Sons, 1891), II, 521.

[4] Timon of Athens, ed. H. J. Oliver, The Arden Edition (London: Methuen, 1969).

[5] Una Ellis-Fermor, "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play," Review of English Studies, 18 (1942), 270-83.

[6] Ibid., p. 274.

[7] Ibid., p. 274.

[8] Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968), p. 344.

[9] Oliver, ed., pp. xxiv-xxv.

[10] George Bagshawe Harrison, Shakespeare's Tragedies (London: Routledge and Paul, 1951), p. 270.

[11] E. K. Chambers, Shakespeare: A Survey (New York: Hill and Wang, 1958), p. 276.

[12] Ellis-Fermor, p. 283.

[13] Harold S. Wilson, On the Design of Shakesperian Tragedy (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 143.

[14] The Plays of William Shakespeare, ed. Samuel Johnson (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1765), VI, 262.

[15] Johnson, ed., p. 198.

[16] Oliver, ed., p. 41.

[17] Paul Bacquet, "Réflexions sur la technique dramatique de Shakespeare dans Timon d'Athènes," Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, Mai-Juin (1965), p. 938.

[18] Philip Sidney, The Defense of Poesy (1595; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968). (No pagination)

[19] The First Folio of Shakespeare, ed. Charlton Hinman (1623; rpt. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968), p. 713.

[20] Johnson, ed., p. 272.

[21] Bacquet, p. 939.

[22] Ibid., p. 940.

[23] Ibid., p. 940.

[24] William Jaggard, Shakespeare Bibliography (Stratford-on-Avon: Shakespeare Press, 1911), p. 471.

[25] John Downes, Roscius Anglicanus or, an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660-1706 (1708; rpt. London: J. W. Jarvis and Son, 1886), p. 37.

[26] The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell, ed. Montague Summers (London: The Fortune Press, 1927), III, 194.

[27] Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare Improved (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927), p. 286.

[28] Timon, ed. Alexander Dyce, in A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays (London: W. Skeffington, 1853), III, 1-95.

[29] John Edmunds, "Shadwell and the Anonymous Timon," Notes and Queries, 212 (1967), p. 220.

[30] Francelia Butler, The Strange Critical Fortunes of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens (Ames: Iowa State Univ. Press, 1966), p. 124.

[31] Ibid., p. 122.

[32] Samuel Richardson, A Dissertation on Comedy, in Theatre in the Age of Garrick (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973), p. 197.

[33] Thomas Davies, Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Anglistica and Americana, 132 (1780; rpt. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972), II, 274-5.

[34] Arthur Murray, The Life of David Garrick (1801; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969), II, 90.

[35] Richard Cumberland, Timon of Athens, Altered from Shakespear. A Tragedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane (1771; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1969).

[36] George C. D. Odell, Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving (1920; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1963), I, 384.

[37] James Love, Timon of Athens. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal On Richmond-Green. Altered from Shakespear and Shadwell, 2nd. ed. (1768; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1969).

[38] David M. Little and George M. Kahrl, eds., The Letters of David Garrick (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press), II, 592.

[39] The First Folio of Shakespeare, p. 698.

[40] Butler, p. 136.

[41] Augustus William Schlegel, A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, trans. John Black, 2nd ed. (London: John Templeman, 1840), II, 221.

[42] George Lamb, Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, As revised at the Theatre Royal, Drury-Lane, on Monday Oct. 28, 1816. Altered and Adapted for Representation (1816; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1972).

[43] Lawrence Huston Houtchens and Carolyn Washburn Houtchens, eds., Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism, 1808-1831 (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1949), p. 134.

[44] Brécourt, Les Flateurs trompez ou l'ennemy des faux amis. Comedie (Caen: Chez J. Jacques Godes, 1699).

[45] Babault, Annales dramatiques; ou dictionnaire général des théâtres (Paris: Henée, 1808-12), II, 112.

[46] Butler, p. 133.

[47] Stanley T. Williams, "Some Versions of Timon of Athens on the Stage," Modern Philology, 18 (1920), p. 283.

[48] Jean A. A. J. Jusserand, Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime (Paris: Colin, 1898).

[49] Henry Carrington Lancaster, A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1929-42), Part iv, II, p. 487.

[50] Lancaster, p. 485.

[51] Jacques Scherer, La Dramaturgie classique en France (Paris: Nizet, 1973), p. 197.

[52] cf. De Lisle's Timon le Misantrope, 1722. Characters are now presented according to their order of appearance.

[53] Scherer, p. 182.

[54] Ibid., p. 190.

[55] Ibid., p. 194.

[56] Lucian, Timon, in The Works of Lucian of Samosata, trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), I, 46.

[57] Lancaster, p. 511.

[58] J. de Laporte and R. N. Chamfort, Dictionnaire dramatique (1776; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967), p. 276.

[59] Nicolas Boileau-Despréeaux, L'Art poétique, Les Petits Classiques Bordas (Paris: Bordas, 1963), p.74.

[60] Lancaster, p. 511.

[61] Brugière de Barante, Arlequin Misantrope, comedie en trois actes, in Le Théatre italien ou le recueil de toutes les comédies et scènes françaises jouées par les comédiens italiens du roi, ed. Evariste Gherardi (1741; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969), vol. III, t. VI, 459-566.

[62] Lancaster attributes this play to Biancolelli; in so doing, he follows the example of the Parfaict brothers, who recognized Louis Biancolelli as B. or de B. in Gherardi's collection. Lancaster also acknowledges that Léris and Lintilhac recognize Barante as the author. In actual fact, this play is more often assigned to the latter playwright.

63 N. B. Du Gérard, Tables Alphabétique et chronologique des pièces représentées sur l'Ancien Théâtre Italien (1750; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), p. 106.

64 Charles D. Brenner, The Théatre Italien: Its Repertory, 1716-1793, Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, 63 (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1961).

65 Henri Lagrave, Le Théâtre et le public à Paris de 1715 à 1750 (Paris: Klincksiek, 1972), p. 343.

66 Brenner, p. 98.

67 Louis François De Lisle de la Drévetière, Timon le Misantrope, comédie en trois actes, in Le Nouveau théatre italien, ou recueil general des comédies représentées par les comédiens italiens ordinaires du roi, Nouvelle éd. (Paris: Chez Briasson, 1753), II, 1-112.

68 Spoken by Mr. Bridgwater in the Prologue to John Kelly's translation of De Lisle's Timon. There is no record of this play having ever been produced.

69 Brenner, p. 310.

70 Lagrave, p. 605.

71 Gustave Attinger, L'Esprit de la commedia dell' arte dans le théâtre français (Paris: Librairie Théâtrale, 1940), pp. 346-8.

72 Evariste Gherardi, ed., Le Théatre italien (1741; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969), vol. I, t. I, Avertissement.

73 Lancaster, p. 685.

74 Louis Ricoboni, Histoire du théâtre italien (1730; rpt. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1968), I, 50.

75 Maurice Sand, The History of the Harlequinade (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1915), I, 50-51.

76 Xavier de Courville, "Jeu italien contre jeu français," Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises, 15 (1963), pp. 189-90.

77 Lancaster, p. 685.

78 In view of the sustained attack on church authorities, it would seem that Deloffre has oversimplified his case in "Aspects inconnus de l'ancien théâtre italien". He states that "ni le Roi, ni les ministres, ni le Parlement, ni l'Eglise n'y sont jamais cités" (p. 177).

79 Mercure, January 1722. Quoted by Xavier de Courville in Luigi Riccoboni dit Lélio (Paris: Droz, 1945), II, 225.

80 Antoine d'Origny, Annales du théâtre italien depuis son origine jusqu'à ce jour (1788; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970).

81 Courville, Luigi Riccoboni, p. 223.

82 Ibid., p. 226.

83 Attinger, p. 414.

84 Hugo Humbert, "Delisle de la Drévetière, sein Leben und seine Werke. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Nouveau Théâtre Italien in Paris," Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur, 27 (1904), p. 38.

85 Courville, Luigi Riccoboni, p. 223.

86 Attinger, p. 417.

87 The Approbation, dated February 18, 1722, is indicative of how the play was acclaimed:

> Cette piéce m'a paru d'un caractère à plaire toujours, elle est pleine de morale, mais cette morale est égayée par les enjouëmens d'un vrai comique, et l'Auteur en joignant ainsi l'utile à l'agréable, a montré qu'il est capable de marcher sur les traces des grands Maîtres qui se sont appliquez à ce genre d'écrire. Je crois que l'impression de son ouvrage confirmera les applaudissemens qu'il a reçûs du Public dans les représentations.

88 Philippe Néricault Destouches, Le Dissipateur, ou l'honnête friponne, comédie en cinq actes et en vers, in Répertoire du théatre françois, ou recueil des tragédies et comédies restées au théatre depuis Rostrou, ed. M. Petitot, Nouvelle éd. (Paris: Foucault, 1817), XI, 305-442.

89 Margaret Gilman, "Le Dissipateur and Timon of Athens," Modern Language Notes, 42 (1927), p. 162.

90 J. F. La Harpe, Lycée, ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne (Paris: Garnery, 1823), XII, 337-8.

91 J.-L. Geoffroy, Cours de littérature dramatique ou recueil par ordre des matières des feuilletons de Geoffroy, 2e éd. (1825; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), II, 396.

92 M. Petitot, "Examen du Dissipateur," in Répertoire du théatre françois, ed. M. Petitot, Nouvelle éd. (Paris: Foucault, 1817), XI, 443.

93 The faithful servant is considered by J. Hankiss as sufficient evidence to demonstrate Destouches' acquaintance with Shakespeare's Timon. See Jean Hankiss, Philippe Néricault Destouches, l'homme et l'oeuvre (Debreczen: Hegedüs and Sándor, 1920), p. 189.

94 In Shadwell's Timon, Melissa is as conceited as is Cidalise; she is, however, more self-satisfied in private than in public.

95 Gilman, p. 165.

96 Philippe Néricault Destouches, Le Glorieux, in Répertoire du théatre françois, ed. M. Petitot, Nouvelle éd. (Paris: Foucault, 1817), XI, 158.

97 Attinger, p. 281.

98 Philippe Néricault Destouches, Le Tambour nocturne, ou le mari devin, in Répertoire du théatre françois, ed. M. Petitot, Nouvelle éd. (Paris: Foucault, 1817), XI, 450-1.

99 In so doing, Destouches is following the Timon tradition on the English stage, though with a different intention.

100 Of the other dramatists who have dealt with the Timon story, Brécourt alone has respected the classical demands of the liaison des scènes.

101 Geoffroy, p. 396.

102 Destouches, Le Tambour nocturne, pp. 451-2.

103 La Harpe, p. 337.

104 Geoffroy, p. 394.

105 Ibid., pp. 394-5.

106 This shipwreck closely resembles the ending to the old Timon comedy and would seem to strengthen the case of scholars who claim that an unknown source is common to Shakespeare's Timon and the old comedy.

107 Louis Petit de Julleville, Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900 (Paris: Colin, 1896-9), VI, 575.

108 Lagraye, p. 62.

109 Gustave Lanson, Nivelle de la Chaussée et la comédie larmoyante, 2e éd. (Paris: Hachette, 1903), p.40.

110 Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism, 1808-1831, p. 134.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Barante, Brugière de. Arlequin Misantrope, comedie en trois actes. In Le Théatre italien ou le recueil de toutes les comédies et scènes françaises jouées par les comédiens italiens du roi. Ed. Evariste Gherardi. 1741; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969. Vol. III, t. VI, 459-566.

Brécourt. Les Flateurs trompez ou l'ennemy des faux amis. Comedie. Caen: Chez Jean Jacques Godes, 1699.

Cumberland, Richard. Timon of Athens, Altered from Shakespear. A Tragedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. 1771; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1969.

De Lisle, Louis François de la Drévetière. Timon le Misantrope, comédie en trois actes. In Le Nouveau théatre italien, ou recueil general des comédies représentées par les comédiens italiens ordinaires du roi. Nouvelle éd. Paris: Chez Briasson, 1753. II, 1-112.

Destouches, Philippe Néricault. Le Dissipateur, ou l'honnête friponne, comédie en cinq actes et en vers. In Répertoire du théatre françois, ou recueil des tragédies et comédies restées au théatre depuis Rostrou. Ed. M. Petitot. Nouvelle éd. Paris: Foucault, 1817. XI, 305-442.

Dyce, Alexander, ed. Timon. In A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays. London: W. Skeffington, 1853. III, 1-95.

Kelly, John. Timon in Love or The Innocent Theft. In Three Centuries of Drama: English, 1701-50. 1733; New York: Readex Microprint, 1956.

Lamb, George. Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, As Revived at the Theatre Royal, Drury-Lane, On Monday, Oct. 28, 1816. Altered and Adapted for Representation. 1816; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1972.

Love, James. Timon of Athens. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal on Richmond-Green. Altered from Shakespear and Shadwell. 2nd ed. 1768; rpt. London: Cornmarket Press, 1969.

Lucian. Timon. In The Works of Lucian of Samosata. Trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. I, 31-53.

Plutarch's Lives. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. II vols. London: William Heinemann, 1916.

Shadwell, Thomas. The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater. As it is Acted at the Duke's Theatre. In The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell. Ed. M. Summers. London: The Fortune Press, 1927. III, 183-275.

Shakespeare, William. Timon of Athens. (The Arden Edition.) Ed. H. J. Oliver. London: Methuen, 1969.

Secondary sources: books and articles quoted or consulted

Attinger, Gustave. L'Esprit de la commedia dell' arte dans le théâtre français. Paris: Librairie Théâtrale, 1940.

Babault. Annales dramatiques; ou dictionnaire général des théâtres. 9 vols. Paris: Hénée, 1808-12.

Bacquet, Paul. "Réflexions sur la technique dramatique de Shakespeare dans Timon d'Athènes." Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, Mai-Juin, (1965), pp. 147-56.

Boileau-Despréaux, Nicolas. L'Art dramatique. (Petits Classiques Bordas:) Paris: Bordas, 1963.

Borgmann, Albert S. Thomas Shadwell: His Life and Comedies. New York: New York Univ. Press, 1928.

Branam, George C. Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakesperian Tragedy. (Univ. of California Publications, English Studies, 14.) Berkeley: Univ. of California Press. 1956.

Brenner, Clarence D. The Théatre Italien: Its Repertory, 1716-1793. (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, 63.) Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1961.

Burner, A. "Philippe Néricault Destouches (1680-1754): Essai de biographie." Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France, 38 (1931), 40-73 and 177-211.

Butler, Francelia. The Strange Critical Fortunes of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens. Ames: Iowa State Univ. Press, 1966.

Chambers, E. K. Shakespeare: A Survey. New York: Hill and Wang, 1958.

Clément, Jean M. B. Anecdotes dramatiques. 3 vols. Paris: Chez la Veuve Duchesne, 1775.

Courville, Xavier de. "Jeu italien contre jeu français." Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises, 15 (1963), 189-99.

Courville, Xavier de. Luigi Riccoboni dit Lélio. 3 vols. Paris: Droz, 1945.

Davies, Thomas. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick. (Anglistica and Americana, 132.) 2 vols. 1780; rpt. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972.

Dawson, Giles E. "A Bibliographical Problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare." The Library, 4th ser., 22 (1942), 25-33.

Deloffre, Frédéric. "Aspects inconnus de l'ancien théâtre italien." Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises, 15 (1963), 177-88.

Destouches, Philippe Néricault. Le Glorieux, comédie en cinq actes et en vers. In Répertoire du théatre françois, ou recueil des tragédies et comédies restées au théatre depuis Rostrou. Ed. M. Petitot. Nouvelle éd. Paris: Foucault, 1817. XI, 155-304.

Destouches, Philippe Néricault. Le Tambour nocturne, ou le mari devin, comédie en cinq actes et en prose. In Répertoire du théatre françois, ou recueil des tragédies et comédies restées au théatre depuis Rostrou. Ed. M. Petitot. Nouvelle éd. Paris: Foucault, 1817. XI, 447-564.

Downes, John. Roscius Anglicanus or, an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660-1706. 1708; rpt. London: J. W. Jarvis and Son, 1886.

Duchartre, Pierre Louis. La Comédie italienne: l'improvisation les canevas, vies, caractères, portraits, masques des illustres personnages de la commedia dell' arte. Nouvelle éd. Paris: Librairie de France, 1925.

Du Gérard, N. B. Tables alphabétique et chronologique des pièces représentées sur l'ancien théâtre italien. 1750; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Edmunds, John. "Shadwell and the Anonymous Timon." Notes and Queries, 212 (1967), 218-21.

Edmunds, John. "Timon of Athens blended with Le Misanthrope: Shadwell's Recipe for Satirical Tragedy." Modern Language Review, 64 (1969), 500-7.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. "Timon of Athens: An Unfinished Play." Review of English Studies, 18 (1942), 270-83.

Genest, John. Some Accounts of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830. 10 vols. Bath:

Geoffroy, J.-L. Cours de littérature dramatique ou recueil par ordre des matières des feuilletons de Geoffroy. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 1825; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Gherardi, Evariste, ed. Le Théatre italien ou le recueil de toutes les comédies et scènes françaises jouées par les comédiens italiens du roi. 3 vols. 1741; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.

Gilman, Margaret. "Le Dissipateur and Timon of Athens." Modern Language Notes, 42 (1927), 162-5.

Hankiss, Jean. Philippe Néricault Destouches, l'homme et l'oeuvre. Debreczen: Hegedüs and Sándor, 1920.

Harrison, George Bagshawe. Shakespeare's Tragedies. London: Routledge and Paul, 1951.

Houtchens, Lawrence Huston and Carolyn Washburn Houtchens, eds. Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism, 1808-1831. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1949.

Humbert, Hugo. "Delisle de la Drévetière, sein Leben und seine Werke. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Nouveau Théâtre Italien in Paris." Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur, 27 (1904), 1-68.

Jaggard, William. Shakespeare Bibliography. Stratford-on-Avon: Shakespeare Press, 1911.

Johnson, Samuel, ed. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London: J. and R. Tonson, 1765.

Jusserand, Jean Adrien Antoine Jules. Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime. Paris: Colin, 1898.

Knight, Charles, ed. The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakespeare. 2nd ed. 8 vols. New York: Collier.

Lagrave, Henri. Le Théâtre et le public à Paris de 1715 à 1750. Paris: Klincksiek, 1972.

La Harpe, J. F. Lycée, ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne. 18 vols. Paris: Garnery, 1823.

Lancaster, Henry Carrington. A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century. 5 vols. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1929-42.

Lanson, Gustave. Nivelle de la Chaussée et la comédie larmoyante. 2e éd. Paris: Hachette, 1903.

Laporte, J. de and R. N. Chamfort. Dictionnaire dramatique. 1776; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967.

Little, David M. and George M. Kahrl, eds. The Letters of David Garrick. 3 vols. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1963.

Molière, Jean-Baptiste Poquelin. Le Misanthrope. (Petits Classiques Bordas.) Paris: Bordas, 1969.

Murray, Arthur. The Life of David Garrick. 1801; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969.

Odell, George C. D. Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving. 2 vols. 1920; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1963.

Oliver, H. J., ed. Timon of Athens. (The Arden Edition.) London: Methuen, 1969.

Origny, Antoine de. Annales du théâtre italien depuis son origine jusqu'à ce jour. 1788; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Parfaict, Claude and François. Histoire de l'ancien theatre italien, depuis son origine en France jusqu'à sa suppression en l'année 1697. Paris: Lambert, 1753.

Petit de Julleville, Louis. Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900. 8 vols. Paris: Colin, 1896-9.

Pope, Alexander. Moral Essay IV. In Selected Poetry and Prose. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963. pp. 209-11.

Price, Cecil. Theatre in the Age of Garrick. Oxford: Blackwell, 1973.

Ricoboni, Louis. Histoire du théatre italien, depuis la decadence de la comedie latine; avec un catalogue des tragedies et comedies italiennes imprimées depuis l'an 1500 jusqu'à l'an 1660 et une dissertation sur la tragedie moderne. 2 vols. 1730; rpt. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1968.

Sand, Maurice. The History of the Harlequinade. 2 vols. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1915.

Scherer, Jacques. La Dramaturgie classique en France. Paris: Nizet, 1973.

Schlegel, Augustus William. A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature. Trans. John Black. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: John Templeman, 1840.

Shakespeare, William. The First Folio. Prepared by Charlton Hinman. 1623; rpt. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.

Sidney, Philip. The Defense of Poesy. 1595; rpt. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968.

Spencer, Hazelton. Shakespeare Improved. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927.

Spurgeon, Caroline. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.

Summers, Montague. The Restoration Theatre. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1934.

Ulrici, Hermann. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. Trans. L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1891.

Vernon, P. F. "Social Satire in Shadwell's Timon." Studia Neophilologica, 35 (1963), 221-6.

Williams, Stanley T. "English Performances of Timon of Athens." Modern Language Notes, 36 (1921), 57-8.

Williams, Stanley T. "Some Versions of Timon of Athens on the Stage." Modern Philology, 18 (1920), 269-85.

Williams, Stanley T. Richard Cumberland: His Life and Dramatic Works. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1917.

Wilson, Harold S. On the Design of Shakesperian Tragedy. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1957.

APPENDIX

FURTHER ALTERATIONS BY LOVE AND CUMBERLAND

Many changes were introduced by Love and Cumberland in order to improve on the dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens. Both dramatists eliminated the marriage of the Old Athenian's daughter to Timon's servant; the episodes involving Apemantus and the Fool, the Banditti, and the comical reappearance of the Lords following the farewell banquet have also been omitted. The blocking for Love's drama indicates the warranted omission of the Merchant who appears only in Act I, 1 of the original, as well as an increased importance in the roles of the Poet, the Painter and the Jeweller who are on stage respectively in five, five and four scenes as compared to the original in which the Poet and the Painter appear twice, the Jeweller only once. In Act III, 1 Love replaces some of the creditors' servants by the Poet, the Painter and the Jeweller. The merit of this innovation is twofold, since on the one hand a closer link between these secondary characters and the central intrigue has been established, while on the other hand the selfish desire of these characters who have previously benefitted from Timon's business has been contrasted to the reluctance of the creditors' servants who recognize their own masters' ingratitude, yet feel they

must obey them. The purpose underlying their reappearance prior to Timon's farewell banquet, a scene in which they take over half of the Lords' speeches in the original, and their subsequent presence during the banquet, is again that of better integrating them into the action. Whereas Shadwell had turned Demetrius into a rascal by presenting Timon with a faithful mistress, and consequently omitted Shakespeare's Act IV, 2, Love, whose Timon is also loved by Evandra, reduces Flavius to the rank of the other servants without needlessly degrading him. Act IV, 2 of the original takes place in an altered form which sees Evandra in the position formerly occupied by the Steward. The retention of this scene in its adapted form is effective in that it upholds the favourable impression Flavius had given of his master, while also linking Evandra to an event outside the principal movement.

Love and Cumberland have both restricted their use of accumulation in adapting the tragedy. Love has represented only once the fluster by the creditors' servants in their attempt to have their debts honoured; Cumberland has limited the efforts of Timon's servants to secure funds. The encounter between Flaminius and Lucullus is witnessed, as is the meeting between Evanthe (who in this case replaces Timon's third servant, Lucilius) and Lucius. The outcome of Servilius' encounter with Sempronius is only reported. Cumberland has also withdrawn the Strangers from this act

and both renovators have omitted the Banditti from Act IV. The enhancement of the play's dramaturgy by Cumberland has been further served by replacing the Lords with the Senators during the banquet, and by ending Act IV with Apemantus' visit, Flavius' one having preceded it. The former alteration, fashioned after Shadwell, indicates that Timon's anger is aimed directly at the Senate, while the latter change in positioning has the effect of ending the act on a declamatory note.